

THE MONTH

VOL. CLXIII

JUNE, 1934

No. 840

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

The Cardinal's Golden Jubilee

ON the 11th of this month will occur an event of very great interest to Catholics in England and, indeed, to Catholics everywhere—the celebration of the priestly Jubilee of H.E. Cardinal Bourne, Archbishop of Westminster. The liturgical words of greeting—*Ecce, Sacerdos magnus!*—which acclaim a Bishop when he enters a church under his jurisdiction, have, in the case of His Eminence, a much more than formal application. For, as occupant of her foremost See, he has represented the Church in England for over thirty years, the leader and spokesman of a small, if growing, body amidst a vast population of heterogeneous belief and hostile tradition. The advancement of the Church to full canonical status, the division of his own large diocese, the erection of other provinces and metropolitan Sees, are all proofs of his prudent and vigorous administration and, quite apart from the normal duties of his exalted office, he has directed the fortunes of the Church in the country at large, during a period of exceptional difficulty, with calm wisdom and conspicuous success. The civil Government of the land has found in him the model Catholic citizen—a staunch supporter of all its legitimate activities and a firm opponent of all measures that fall short of justice. In fighting with such quiet persistence for parental rights in education, he has been the champion of the whole community, always, under a secular bureaucracy, exposed to attacks on its freedom, and has had the satisfaction of knowing that he has brought the State to recognize that, without definite religious teaching, there can be no proper training of the young. In upholding, in his various utterances on social questions, the human prerogatives of the worker, he has, if we may say so, worn worthily the mantle of his great predecessor, Manning. In defending the unchanging standard of Christian morality against the evils of divorce and race-suicide and the growing laxity of letters, he has issued a challenge to those Christ-

ians who hope to overcome the world by conforming to it. Finally—for this is a Note, not a treatise—he has given, by his advocacy of international peace, and of a League of Nations as the only human means of attaining it, clear guidance to all those who have not yet realized how they should and can reconcile patriotism with their membership of the Church Universal. Stimulated by their concern on account of the Cardinal's recent illness, his whole flock, and many others besides, will make this happy Jubilee the occasion of more fervent prayers for the preservation of so precious and fruitful a life.

Catholic Confederation at Last

THE English hierarchy took occasion of the Feast of Whit-Sunday, the birthday of the Church, to issue a joint Pastoral foreshadowing the establishment of an episcopal "National Board of Catholic Action," which should mean a great accession of strength to our body. This is welcome news for those who have long felt the need of such a co-ordination of Catholic activities, one which was actually attempted a good many years ago, yet failed to get adequate support. A "Catholic Confederation" was formally constituted at the National Congress at Leeds in 1910,¹ with a Central Council intended to serve as a means of intercommunication between the various diocesan units. Two years later, at Norwich, it was still incomplete, numbering only seventeen federal bodies out of a possible twenty-eight, and His Eminence made another appeal, stressing the absolutely non-political character of the Movement and expressing his hope that "it would unite all Catholics of every political creed, of every nationality and every social position." The War, doubtless, prevented further development for the time, whilst increasing the need of it. At the Liverpool Congress in 1920, another vigorous attempt was made by Mr. Edward Eyre to revive and invigorate it; still with no lasting result. The "Catholic Confederation" is still listed in *The Catholic Directory* amongst societies of national scope, but the mere fact that their Lordships are, without reference to its existence, projecting the formation of something equivalent, may be taken as a sign that its always languid and fluttering life has some time ago come to an end. There can be no doubt that

¹ See, for its history, constitution and programme, the *Catholic Social Year-Book* for 1911, pp. 121—126.

its successor, following on combined and effective diocesan organization, will be born under a happier star.

An Example from the States

THE formation of this Episcopal Board naturally recalls the corresponding organization in the United States, the "National Catholic Welfare Conference," the origin of which, curiously enough, was connected with the Golden Jubilee of another Cardinal. For it was when he was celebrating the fifteenth anniversary of his consecration that Cardinal Gibbons, in 1919, proposed to his brethren his scheme for turning the temporary "National Catholic War Council," formed in the previous year, into a permanent means of co-ordinating Catholic activity in all matters of importance throughout the vast area of the States. All its subsequent history has shown how immensely the Church in America has benefited by this great means of harmonizing the work of 102 dioceses. It is carried on by an Administrative Committee of seven prelates, acting through a central bureau at Washington, and ruling the activities of five departments—Education, Social Action, Legislation, Press and Publicity, and Lay Organization. There are further sub-divisions, notably those concerned with the last-named department, viz., the National Council of Catholic Men and the National Council of Catholic Women, which concern lay activities especially. An ably-conducted monthly journal called *Catholic Action*, preserves the necessary contact between the different parts of the whole gigantic scheme, whilst recording what is being done and what projected. Much other helpful literature has been produced by the N.C.W.C., viz., the series of episcopal pamphlets on Social Reconstruction which have anticipated a good deal of the President's plans, and provide them with such a very effective backing of Catholic opinion. A huge and elaborate organization of this sort¹ will clearly not be needed to bring about Catholic solidarity in this small country. What the joint Pastoral proposes is the co-ordination of the various Catholic activities in each diocese—a measure which has already been set on foot in several—and, once the dioceses have thus focused their efforts, a combination of all under a central Board of direction will effect that corporate unity needed for the better protection and furtherance of Catholic rights.

¹ It has been described at length in these pages by Father Siedenbueg, S.J., of Chicago: see *THE MONTH*, March, 1925, p. 245.

The Legion of Decency

ONE of the chief works of the administrative office of the American N.C.W.C. consists in combating the growing evil of indecent motion-pictures. In March we mentioned the exhaustive report published by an episcopal investigation Committee which showed the need of drastic and immediate reform. Following on this exposure, the bishops have urged the faithful throughout the country to join "a Legion of Decency," the main pledge of which is to avoid, and get others to avoid, evil cinema displays. Although nothing more is involved than what already obliges the individual conscience, the shunning of occasions of sin, the mobilization of the faithful everywhere for this object cannot fail to affect the purveyors of vice in the only way in which they can be reached, viz., through their pockets. We read in the *Universe* (May 18th) that in the diocese of Albany sixty special preachers have been engaged during May to urge Catholics to use this means of reforming the films. The root of the evil lies, of course, in Hollywood itself, as well as in those great commercial undertakings which market its "goods," and which often leave no choice between the foul and the clean to the theatre managers. However, a year or two of effective boycott would make a world of difference even to Hollywood. In this country, where the evil is no less, the Archbishop of Cardiff has already started a campaign of abstention amongst his flock which, if, under the new National Board, it becomes nation-wide, will seriously lessen the profits of this traffic in vice, and help to save what is in itself a useful form of entertainment from being a source of corruption. Our police-laws are of little use, and all that the Cinema Trade Board of Censorship can do is to list the worst of their exhibits as "For Adults Only." The only protection left to the public is to leave the vile thing alone until it sheds its vileness. The harm done, not only to native morals, but even to the earthly interests of the white races, by the indiscriminate display of the worst of Hollywood's output throughout the East is notorious. We boast of our civilizing mission and justify our presence in India and elsewhere on those grounds, whilst allowing free play to agencies of depravity. At home, at any rate, Catholics, and indeed all Christians, are morally bound to free themselves from responsibility for ill-doing by patronizing only what is clean and wholesome.

Disarmament Conference: Fears and Hopes

THE World Economic Conference was abandoned at the end of July last year, after its success had been declared essential to the economic recovery of the nations, because of their economic self-centredness. It would seem that they are contemplating a much worse evil, the abandonment of the Disarmament Conference, just because of their political self-centredness. Because of Germany's insistence on equality of national status—a demand which, at this date, cannot be denied in law or equity—and because the Reich is proceeding to re-arm as fast as it can, France has abandoned the principle on which the Conference is based, viz., reduction of armaments, and, by falling back on the principle of armed security, has set the world again on the familiar pre-War path, armament competition. If that spirit of despair spreads, the War will have been fought wholly in vain. But there is surely enough sanity left in the world to avoid that disaster. Germany has consented to a limitation of armaments by agreement, and a permanent system of inspection—a half-loaf which is decidedly better than no bread. Great Britain and Italy are ready to agree, but the French "Superior Council for National Defence"—or is it "Le Comité des Forges"?—seem blindly bent on no agreement rather than a limited one. Meanwhile, the irony of the matter is that Germany is being helped to re-arm by the supply of raw materials from all sides, including France itself, the argument in support of such paradoxical, not to say traitorous, conduct always being—"if we don't supply it, others will." France, because Germany is acting "illegally," will not join in any convention which might seem to condone that breach of law, nor, in the circumstances, state plainly what guarantees of security it wants. The only reliable guarantee is friendship with Germany, based on recognition of equal rights and the pursuit of common good, with collective sanctions against individual violators of peace. That is so obvious that we are not wholly despondent about the outcome of the General Commission of the Conference which meets on May 29th.

Peace or Dividends?

IT would seem that at long last the world is waking up to the scandal of the unregulated traffic in armaments. It has been obvious all along to those who cared to think that to

allow the motive of personal profit to interfere with the efforts made by suffering mankind to get rid of the disease of war, is a crime against civilization. We have laboriously, throughout the ages, built up the supremacy of law within the State, but the further extension of the reign of law to the community of nations has found its chief obstacle, in the latter days, in the fact that many powerful financial interests would be, if not ruined, at least crippled, by the abolition, or even the serious diminution, of war between nations. The report (issued on May 12th) of the League of Nations Commission about the Bolivia-Paraguay war revealed that the conflict has been prolonged, in defiance of manifold obligations of either side to seek a solution by negotiation, because they are constantly supplied with stores of up-to-date armaments by American and European countries. All these countries are bound by the Kellogg Pact to discountenance international warfare but, baulked by their war-traders, they cannot take collective action to prevent two civilized nations from trying to annihilate each other, wasting their youth and their resources, mortgaging their future, and damaging, as far as their influence extends, the movement towards world-peace. The war must go on lest the shareholders suffer. The United States, France and Great Britain could stop that war to-morrow if they would control their arms-exports. As neither individually nor collectively have they attempted to do so, they must share in its guilt. And unless the League of Nations can bring these powerful influences under control, they will in the end destroy the League, as they have been all along the main cause of its impotence. They have all but destroyed the Disarmament Conference which, like the South American war, has lasted for two years, and yet has not diverted a single shilling from the colossal funds spent on armaments, but rather seen them steadily increase.

The States and the War-Traffic

DISREGARDING, in many ways, social obligations at home, American business is the less likely to pay heed to international consequences. And so, indeed, we find the States prominent in that sinister arms-traffic which to-day is holding up all prospects of world-peace. America, it is true, is not bound by the League Covenant, but America is the prime author of an international implement of even wider scope—the Kellogg Pact. We should, therefore, expect the

States to be foremost in the effort to make war-mongering cease to pay. We must own that both President Roosevelt and his predecessor have intervened at Geneva with proposals for immediate and drastic reduction of war-material, but the war-traders are not afraid of benevolent suggestions unbacked by anything practical. At home the President, wishing to provide work or to respond to Japanese aggressiveness, has not seemingly been able to refuse his sanction to the various vast expenditures called for by his fighting departments, so his advice to Europe is discounted by his own practice. No more than ourselves has America been able to escape the chaos of two incompatible ideals—to establish peace and to prepare for war. But at her door, we fear, must be laid the chief blame for the survival and spread of private traffic in war-material. The facts are given in a fully-documented pamphlet—"Armament Manufacture and Trade," issued by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (No. 295), where the unhappy part played by American statesmen in rendering all attempts to regulate the activities of the war-traders futile is frankly disclosed. When the Allies, in fear of the monster they had invoked in their desperate need, framed, in September, 1919, a convention for the rigid control, and, in certain cases, the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of munitions, the U.S. Government expressed "cordial sympathy" with their efforts, but found itself "unable to approve of the Convention." And that, until recently, has been the consistent attitude of this, the greatest war-material producing country in the world, towards the repeated attempts made by European Governments to secure unanimity in this matter. Not until November, 1932, when the Disarmament Conference appointed a "Committee for the Regulation of the Trade in, and the Private and State Manufacture of, Arms and Implements of War," did the U.S.A. consent to co-operate with the efforts which humanity is making to be freed from the incubus which the conscienceless pursuit of profit through war-trading has imposed upon it. The President has the power to make that Committee operative; for that reason, we wish he were through with his "New Deal," and could attend to matters of even wider import.

Christianity versus Mammon in the States

WHATEVER mistakes President Roosevelt may be making, or may have made, in enforcing his "New Deal," no one who knows the evil he is endeavouring to over-

throw—the inveterate traditions of a wholly Godless Capitalism—can withhold from him sympathy and support. The fact is, he is a Christian and his opponents are not. In the words of Mgr. John A. Ryan, what he wants the country to achieve is “genuine self-government in industry and a sane and realistic measure of industrial democracy,” or, as another observer, the Editor of *America* (May 19th), says, “Catholic social theory and that of the New Deal meet on common ground, viz., that industry, commerce and finance are collective social activities, even more than they are personal and individual.” That is the new ideal which the President’s activities, so usefully summarized in his fine book—“On Our Way,” is trying to beat into the hard head (and harder heart) of that “rugged individualist,” the American business man, by codes and regulations and other processes of law. Has he succeeded in awakening an appreciation of natural justice and human rights in minds long accustomed to think such things outside the scope of “business”? Listen again to Mgr. Ryan :

When I consider the wholesale violation of the NRA codes: the systematic efforts of the larger and stronger business concerns to injure and destroy the smaller and weaker: the unscrupulous imposition of unfair prices upon the consumer: the defrauding of labour through unconscionably low wages and through various forms of “chiseling”: the trickery and tyranny of wealthy and powerful corporations in forcing their employees into company unions, in preventing the formation of independent labour organizations, and in violating or evading the terms of the Recovery Act through other crooked devices . . . when I think of all this, I am tempted to wonder whether, as a people, we have sufficient honesty left to get out of the depression.¹

This enumeration of the forces against the President—and only about half has been quoted—shows how much he needs the support of honest men. We are not so foolish as to indict all American business men, or indeed any, of conscious fraud and dishonesty, but they have been brought up in an economic system which, on the whole, disregarded social and ethical obligations. And they find it hard to change.

¹ Address delivered at Notre Dame University, April 21st, quoted in *Catholic Action*, May.

"Modernism" for the Young

IF anything were needed to show the disastrous possibilities of relying upon "experience" rather than upon "authority" in the matter of conveying religious instruction to the young, a letter in *The Times* for May 22nd would provide it. The letter was written by a schoolmaster who is all for religious training—"a full life without religion [he says] is a contradiction in terms, half the troubles in the world are due to the failure of religion among us, and we have no hope of emerging from those troubles without a renaissance of religion." Yet, believing all this, the good man pleads for the avoidance of dogma in religious teaching—"To all knowledge we come by a gradual process of growth, and to our religion above all; for our religion is the sum of our knowledge and life experience." Again, "a dogma is the expression of a train of experience realized; without the experience the mere expression or formula is empty. That is why the teaching of religious dogma to children is the root cause of so many errors." One can see what the schoolmaster has in mind: he dreads the imparting of religious knowledge which remains merely intellectual, and does not influence conduct. But he ignores that in proper religious training it is the will that is aimed at through the intellect. The dogma of God's existence as our Creator and Father and Judge, gives a strong motive for our obedience to His commandments, however pragmatically justified such obedience is. Dogma is *not* primarily "the expression of a train of experience realized." It is a truth concerning God or our relations with Him, conveyed to us by competent authority in the first instance, by which we are meant to guide our lives. In the rational order knowledge precedes action. That a large amount of knowledge is gained in the observational sciences by the synthesis of experiments is, of course, true, but even so, in proper scientific training, the pupil begins by accepting ascertained results. It is the "modernism" underlying this schoolmaster's contention which is "the root cause of so many errors" outside the Church, and makes agreement between Catholics and others regarding religious syllabuses well-nigh impossible. We wonder how our anti-dogmatist would "gradually grow" into a knowledge of the dogma of the Trinity or of the Virgin Birth, and what idea he has of the function of grace in making easy the adhesion to revealed Truth.

British Fascism

THE question of Fascism in this country is still exercising the minds of British Catholics. Naturally, what is seen in Italy, where political and civil liberty, as we know it, does not exist, and, much more, in Germany where Paganism is at grips with Christian ideology as expressed by the Catholic Church, does not dispose a Catholic to embrace a system which bears so many traces of its origin. And, apart from the question of morality, anyone may well hesitate before trying to change our form of government which, with all its drawbacks—and they are many—is a native product and has grown with the growth of the nation for many centuries. Until Fascism can show itself to be compatible with a reasonable amount of individual liberty and with a full recognition of the rights of conscience, it would be extremely rash to set aside in its favour a form of rule under which personal freedom is respected, as it is here, where the worst kind of oppression is due to a faulty economic system. It is noteworthy that the first act of the Totalitarian State is to control and censor the Press, *i.e.*, to prevent real knowledge of facts getting abroad, and so to create ignorance, the better to suppress criticism. Now, to place human government out of reach of free criticism is good neither for the government nor for the governed: it tends to make the one tyrannical and the other servile. The regimented May-Day demonstration staged in Germany was pathetic or ridiculous, according as the foreign onlooker was affected towards that great people. The glory of a State rests in the fact that its members are citizens, not subjects, giving loyal obedience to a Constitution which exists for their interests and respects their inalienable rights. There are no citizens in the Third Reich; in Italy the Church has, with difficulty, rescued her children from complete subordination to the State; in Austria, where the influence and status of religion are fully provided for, there is greater hope that the freedom of parliamentary rule may be secured without its defects. There is some truth in Pope's saying—"what'er is best administered is best," and Austria, if not interfered with, may yet prove that an Authoritarian government can be wholly free from tyranny. It is very ominous that the founder of British Fascism puts religion, as the ultimate determinant of conduct, in a subordinate position, and makes the welfare of the State the final standard of morality. (See quotation from "Greater Britain," *Tablet*, May 26th.)

An Alternative to Government by Party?

HERR DOLLFUSS, in framing the Austrian Constitution, which came into force on April 30th, claimed to follow the lines traced by the Pope in "Quadragesimo Anno." But that great document leaves politics severely alone. The Church gives its blessing to no particular form of rule, but only condemns those not in harmony with the moral law. One must wait to see whether the various vocational groups envisaged in the Constitution are of natural or artificial growth. Meanwhile, one can gratefully recognize that the worst abuses of the German system are avoided. Perhaps the description of the ideal Corporative regime, given by M. Jacques Maritain,¹ will help to an understanding of the Austrian experiment. He writes (*italics ours*):

Chaque corporation serait là comme une personne morale composée de tous ceux qui, manuellement, intellectuellement, financièrement, etc., collaborent à une certaine œuvre organique; les corporations, personnes morales et douées d'autant d'autonomie que le permet l'organisation du tout social, étant ainsi *tout autre chose que les services publics d'un Etat*. Et, selon cette conception, *aussi peu étatiste que possible*, ce n'est pas *par les rouages d'une bureaucratie*, mais c'est par les décisions d'hommes choisis pour chef, ayant, à tous les degrés, les privilèges et les charges de la responsabilité que serait régie une telle cité corporative.

The above sketch is, of course, too slight to show how these Trade Corporations or Guilds which, if completely autonomous, might fall under the sway of Mammon just as the Capitalist system has done, are themselves to be regulated so as to safeguard the consumer from exploitation, but it is clear that, in the Christian conception, the corporations are designed precisely to prevent that subordination of every enterprise in the community to political ends, and to oppose that intense centralization which tends, in Fascism, to build up a Slave-State. The Pope, in "Quadragesimo Anno," points out the difficulty of maintaining a proper "social equilibrium" between the excesses of Bureaucracy and Socialism, and, as ever, counsels his children to keep the middle way. Herr Dollfuss's experiment is, therefore, being watched with much interest by Catholics in every land. One aspect, at any rate, of the Austrian Constitution should meet with Catholic

¹ "Du Régime temporel de la Liberté: Questions Disputées," 1933.

approbation : it aims at destroying that unChristian warfare of classes, arising from the division of the community into the "Haves" and the "Have-nots," a division which the present Capitalist system tends always to accentuate. It embodies, in fact, the last two items of a remarkable "message" which the Cardinal sent to an industrial paper towards the end of the War, and which ran as follows : "Society should not be a struggle of competing individuals or classes, but a close-knit human brotherhood of mutual service : the aim of that society should be human welfare and not merely the production or acquisition of wealth." Even Socialists, resenting, as they do so bitterly, the suppression of the Vienna Bolsheviks, whom they look on as merely Socialists, can surely find no fault with that ideal.

Quos Deus vult perdere . . .

COMPARED with their kinsmen in Germany, the Austrian people under the new Constitution are enjoying a regime of freedom and self-respect. Nazi-ism, like the unjust judge in the Scripture, fearing not God nor regarding man, seems bent on pushing to all lengths its conception of a State united both in blood and in a single political mind. Between the pursuit of that impossible and undesirable ideal, and the aims of the Godless Soviets, there is no difference worth noting. Both are in flat contradiction of indefeasible divine and human rights ; both are built upon a completely unsound philosophy ; both, we hold, are doomed to failure through inherent rottenness. The Nazi are foolishly persecuting both Jews and Christians—the one on sociological grounds as racially inferior, the other because they will not allow themselves to be absorbed in the State. The recent revival of the "ritual-murder" charge against the Jews—which ran a prolonged and disgraceful course in France during the Dreyfus *affaire*—is alone enough to indicate the fearful recklessness with which the new rulers of Germany are prepared to prosecute their professed aim of restoring their country's good name amongst the nations. That their people seem, at present, to submit is due to the fact that man must have some ideal and, if he ceases to find it in the service of God, he will transfer his worship to the State. But that idol, sooner or later, will prove his destruction.

¹ For the vogue of this abominable accusation during that unhappy time, when even Catholic priests of repute were not ashamed to give it support, see "Anti-Semitism and the Charge of Ritual Murder," by H. Thurston, S.J., *THE MONTH*, June, 1898.

THE INDEFECTIBLE CHURCH

I HAVE often wondered whether we at all realize the utter uniqueness of the phenomenon that the Church presents to-day when regarded merely as a human organization. Suppose that for a few moments we discard our faith altogether and look at the world as it would appear to us were it only a spectacle of human activities—what kind of picture should we see? What would be its main outlines?

One would be conflict, conflict in our relations with each other and dissension both within and between our various racial, economic and social groups. Another would be impermanence, instability and flux in our social, political and economic institutions. Another would be doubt and apprehension concerning everything and a great mental confusion with respect to the meaning and purpose of human life and human nature itself. In short, it would be a picture suggesting something like a general failure of the human race to manage its own affairs.

But in the middle of this chaos we should see one remarkable phenomenon standing out in the sharpest possible contrast to everything else around it which could not fail to arrest our attention. It is the one stable thing in a world of instability, the one permanent thing in a world of change, the one thing sure of itself in a world of doubt, and it is the oldest living thing in the world—the Catholic Church. Yet it shows no sign of age, but seems to possess all the energy and vitality of youth. It is everywhere on the earth and the same thing everywhere; it is, in fact, the only universal thing that there is. Everywhere it is at home; it speaks all languages. We find it in the world's centres of civilization and culture and in the remote recesses of savage tribes. It busies itself with all human activities; it embodies as does nothing else on the earth the old Latin adage, *Nihil humanum a me alienum*. Yet it seems to defy all the laws by virtue of which all other human institutions have come to naught, laws which should, it seems, have proved its doom at its very birth, and countless times during its long career.

Naturally, this would call for closer inquiry because of the absolute uniqueness of the phenomenon. Inquiry would reveal an astounding series of facts. It would appear that this

thing began some nineteen centuries ago in a little province of the Roman Empire with a dozen men and a wildly improbable story. The official annalists of these men are at pains to let us know that the twelve included one traitor, one perjurer and coward, and nine plain cowards, leaving only one of the number unsmirched. The story they told was of an event which, if true, was the supreme historical event of all time, that of the life, death and resurrection of God-made-man. The gospel they preached ran counter to everything which the world around them held to be true, and to all the rules of conduct that the men of that day were accustomed to practise. They made a claim upon men's minds and hearts that, humanly speaking, was impudent in the extreme, in that they boldly challenged the whole philosophy of life held by the civilized world of their day. They claimed the power to teach unchanging truth and teach it with certainty, and they claimed the authority to lay down the rules of right conduct for mankind independently of all earthly powers. Could any enterprise be imagined more hopeless in its very conception?

Yet, somehow, it survived and it grew, and in its survival and its growth, it was as extraordinary as in its birth, in that it successfully defied the things that wrecked all other institutions on the earth. It was, like all other human institutions, administered by men. Its history shows that there are few weaknesses and few crimes known to man which were not at one time or another committed by some of those who governed it, and this from the highest to the lowest office. Scholars indeed have specialized in recent times in enumerating and describing these things. As a matter of fact, they have probably not told us the half. The greatest Catholic poet of the Middle Ages did not hesitate to place two of the Church's supreme heads in his hell!—one of them while he was still living! Yet, in spite of all this, three remarkable facts appear. One is that at the very times when the Church was suffering most from the misdeeds of those who governed her, great Saints arose, who were most unworldly when the Church's ministers were most worldly, most ascetic when sensuality reigned around them and most courageous when others were cowardly. The Church was never for a moment without this distinguishing mark of *active* holiness. A second is that precisely when there arose dissensions on doctrine and powerful heresiarchs appeared in her ranks, great doctors

arose in her defence and the heresies died. These heresies, in fact, did but serve to develop the Church's teaching. Most remarkable of all is the third fact. Throughout its entire career the Church never retracted or contradicted one jot or tittle of its teaching on faith or morals. The weakest and the wickedest of its popes and bishops were never untrue to the Church's mission in this one respect.

Do we at all realize the tremendous significance of this last fact? Let us remember that her teaching on doctrine and conduct has always been in sharp conflict with the mind of the world around her. Chesterton has reminded us that at all times she has been reproached—now for being too strict, now for being too lax, now too logical, now too irrational, now too ascetic, now too worldly, now too uncompromising, now too yielding, now too round, now too square—in short, always "too" much something or "too" much its opposite. Yet, through it all she has never had to cancel a word of her teaching in faith or morals, although always under attack in both!

For this remarkable fact there is no parallel in human history. It is utterly paradoxical. Nor is this by any means all. Something still more remarkable would meet our eye. Not only has she herself never contradicted herself, but she has never been successfully contradicted. And, perhaps most remarkable of all, there is to-day for the first time in centuries no serious attempt to assail her teaching on the ground that it is controverted by any single fact of human knowledge. There is to-day, as both Mr. Belloc and Dr. Fulton Sheen have pointed out, no attack upon the Church's position that can be called intellectual in any real sense of the word—attack from either within or without.

We should also observe that this cessation of intellectual attack on the Church's position has followed upon a severe intellectual assault within very recent times—indeed, within living memory. The great attack was made upon three fronts. The authenticity of her documents was attacked by the so-called Higher Criticism. Her entire theology was attacked by so-called Science. Her philosophy was attacked by a philosophy of relativism. Each of these attacks broke down, yet each seemed for a time to be irresistible. What remains to-day of the Higher Criticism of sixty years ago? What remains to-day of the Scientific Materialism that we old folk met when we left school and college? And what is the most vigorous school of philosophic thought in the world to-day

but the old *philosophia perennis*, which even Dean Inge considers "not merely the only possible Christian Philosophy, but the only system that will be found ultimately satisfying"? Moreover, it was at the very height of the battle when the tide seemed running most strongly against the Church that she flung again, this time in terms of formal dogma at the Vatican Council, her age-old challenge to the world around her. If there be anything in human annals to match the sublime arrogance—I speak humanly—of that challenge, I cannot imagine where it may be found.

Am I wrong in supposing that to any keenly intelligent person this phenomenon should, of all earthly things, have most interest because of its utter uniqueness in all respects? In the entire phantasmagoria of earthly affairs there is nothing else that in any real sense resembles it. Here is something permanent in the midst of violent change, stable in the midst of general instability, definite in the midst of doubt—literally the one and only thing standing up solid and steady in a world of flux.

And we should observe one more significant phenomenon. In all this discord and clashing of opinion, men outside the Church's ranks are agreed upon one thing and one thing only—opposition to the Church. Of all institutions on the earth this one seems to have the unique capacity to set the world against it, and to arouse a hostility quite peculiar in its intensity and universal in its scope; all the greater for its inarticulate and instinctive character, and the often utterly unreasonable and absurd manner in which it manifests itself. We should also note that ignorance as to its teachings is almost universal, even among those who are regarded in all other respects as scholars and learned men, and that this ignorance is accounted generally as in nothing detracting from their reputation!

Now what would we be driven to conclude from all this? Is it not clear that we should have to infer that there was something quite other than human in this extraordinary organization which rendered it immune to the inexorable laws of death and decay that govern all other earthly things? What could it be? Now, if the story told by the Church of her origin were true—could it be true? Improbable as it was, it *could* in fact be true, for it is not illogical in itself, it does not violate reason and it has not in fact been proved to be untrue. If it *were* true, it would explain everything; if it is

not true, the thing is, on its face, inexplicable on any theory that reason could accept.

In describing this phenomenon have I said anything that is not plainly evident to anyone with a reasonably observant eye for visible facts, whether or not he had faith of any kind in anything? I do not think so. Should not the mere facts give such a man, as the French say, furiously to think?

But, for us Catholics with nineteen centuries behind us and the gift of faith—How does the Church's position in the world appear to-day? I think we can note the following facts.

First, that at no time since the Middle Ages has the doctrinal teaching of the Church been as free from internal controversy *in detail* as it is to-day. Debate on her theology has practically died down!

Second, at no time in many centuries has the *passive* holiness of the Church as distinguished from the *active* holiness been on a higher level than to-day. The morale of the Church army from the top to the bottom is excellent, better, perhaps, than in a thousand years. We have no scandals in our hierarchy or our clergy, secular or regular, nor any menace of schism, and we can see clear signs of a definite enhancement of spiritual life in the great mass of our people.

Third, coincident with the subsidence of intellectual attacks upon the Church's position is a recrudescence of active physical persecution of a most venomous and determined kind in many lands, and those often with a long Catholic heritage. Also, we can see the outcroppings in other lands, even in our own, of a hostility both intense and instinctive which may easily in time develop into genuine persecution. We talk much and often of "tolerance." It is empty talk; in the matter of the Church the world has no such thing, for where indifference ceases "tolerance" also ends.

Fourth, we can, moreover, easily discern the quarter from which the new attack is preparing; the enemy is already in sight. It is the Absolute State, the so-called lay State which claims unlimited power over the bodies and souls of its people. We see it rising all around us. How many people realize that the very essence of human liberty lies in a limitation upon the power of the Civil Authority, that the principle of such limitation is the very cornerstone of our governmental system, and that the American Declaration of Independence in laying it down did but repeat the Church's teaching as expressed by her great doctors from St. Thomas Aquinas to

Cardinal St. Robert Bellarmine? The Supreme Court of the United States has told us in the plainest language that the Constitution is the body and the letter, of which the Declaration of Independence is the spirit and the thought. Yet a college president lately referred contemptuously to it as "a theory of abstract human rights"; I wonder how many more of his class in this country would join him in this concept of the Declaration! The Absolute State is a deadly threat to human liberty as well as an attack on the Church. We know that the Church will survive, but liberty may go into long eclipse—even in this land of the free.

Lastly, Doctor Sheen has reminded us that it is from paganism the Church has drawn its richest harvest of converts, and it is with a world now largely relapsed into paganism that we shall have to deal. It is very probable that it is from the seed of martyr blood that the Church will reap another great harvest in the years to come. Interesting, however, is it to witness the gropings of men who strive to find a principle of order for the world's economic troubles, and to note that they are re-discovering a very old thing—old as the Church itself—the need for justice in men's relation with each other. Interesting, too, is the re-discovery by our "New Humanists" of the spiritual side of man's nature, and their recognition of the consequences of what we know as the Fall of Man. But I think that, for some time to come, as the Church's intellectual position becomes visibly more commanding and appealing to the really clear-eyed observer and the really robust mentality, the more violent will be the hostility of the ignorant many. This hostility has its main root in the natural resistance of man to a demand that he shall control his natural appetites instead of giving them free rein. It is supported by a state of mingled ignorance and superstition on a scale unexampled in history. That the superstition is "scientific" makes it none the less superstition, and the ignorance is all the more deadly because it is the ignorance that thinks it knows. It is from the victims of that ignorance and that superstition that we may expect both the persecution and, later, the converts.

Does this sound pessimistic? With the Church there is room for neither optimism nor pessimism, because there is no room for doubt or conjecture. We know that she is indestructible, we know that her life must be perpetual warfare, and we know that she cannot fail in her mission. This is the Victory, our Faith!

THOMAS F. WOODLOCK.

GOLDEN JUBILEE OF THE C.T.S.

IT is not often that the Church in England has offered to it such an opportunity as that afforded by the Golden Jubilee celebrations and activities of the Catholic Truth Society; for here is an occasion when it is possible for every parish and mission in the land, whether large or small, wealthy or poor, in town or village, to collaborate in a way which will not only pay well-deserved honour to the "Jubilarian" but will, at the same time, bring credit and merit to the parish, the church, and all concerned. Such collaboration may be effected by contributing in a substantial manner towards the furtherance of that essential work for which the C.T.S. has become famous the world over: the work of making more and more widely known through the medium of the renowned C.T.S. pamphlet the Truths of the Catholic Church.

Furthermore, this act is one which involves the barest minimum of trouble and no cost; indeed, it may even show a financial profit, as a large number of churches in different parts of the country can already testify. Yet, by contrast, the magnitude of the consequences is a matter beyond our calculation. "There must be hundreds of thousands of people," declares His Eminence the Cardinal, "who, by means of these pamphlets, have been brought nearer to God."

This simple yet great act of co-operation with the Society in its year of Golden Jubilee is this: In every church or chapel where there is as yet no C.T.S. pamphlet case, to install one; and in every church or chapel where there is already such a case, to make sure that, for the future, it will be well and properly stocked and tended.

Of course, there are many churches where these remarks will not apply. There are pamphlet cases all over the country which are a joy to behold; which do credit to the priest responsible for their installation and to the Box-tenders who maintain them so efficiently; changing the stock frequently so that it never gets the chance to look "stale," keeping them well stocked with pamphlets appropriate to the season so that they are never out of date, always maintaining at least a few pamphlets calculated to meet the requirements of the inquiring or merely inquisitive non-Catholic. The C.T.S. files are full of letters of gratitude from inquisitive people who have

first had their thoughts seriously directed towards the Catholic Church by the chance picking up of some C.T.S. doctrinal or explanatory pamphlet.

These unique little publications, literally storehouses of untold treasure, are undoubtedly performing a great work for the spread of the Faith, and a well merited tribute was paid to them by the Bishop of Brentwood at a C.T.S. annual meeting a few years back, where he said that "next to the Church itself, the greatest work for the Faith in this country is that being done by the Catholic Truth Society." Numerous churches up and down the country show their belief in, and their admiration for, the C.T.S. pamphlet by bestowing a fitting care upon the cases designed for their display.

But there are others !

My work takes me all over England, and having what may fairly be termed "inside information," both abundant and certain, as to the value of C.T.S. pamphlets, I have long made it my interest to visit churches on my travels and to observe how these pamphlets are treated in general ; to note to what extent they are given their rightful opportunities of carrying out the work for which they have been created. In this way I have visited well over a thousand churches, and while I have found that the great majority give the pamphlet and its case a fair chance, and that a goodly number are quite outstanding, I have also discovered that *there are others*.

The outstanding merit of many workers in this field calls for no honourable mention here ; their reward does not lie in human approbation. But the "others" have only themselves to blame if, with all due charity, I mention their backwardness in this paper, not as a judge, but merely as an historian, leaving conscience to do its proper work.

After all that has been said and written in praise of the C.T.S. pamphlet by the whole English hierarchy and even by the Holy Father himself, what can we think of a *cathedral* where, all unknown, surely, to its Diocesan, the old and very dirty pamphlet case is allowed to fall into such neglect that its miserable collection of ancient and begrimed documents appear more appropriate to a museum than to the principal church of a diocese ?

If a cathedral gives such a poor example there will be found excuses for churches which fail to do better than their leader ; but there can be little excuse for the church where the pamphlet case was found to contain just three very tired and drooping pamphlets turning yellow with age, and which, on

closer examination, proved to be copies of a Lenten Pastoral of a revered bishop long since gone to his rest.

Nor can I find forgiveness for a certain church in a very Catholic district. Here I discovered a case of unusual design with folding doors, but I wondered when, and by whom, those doors had last been opened. Not, I fervently hoped, by an inquiring non-Catholic! For when I ventured to stir them from their long rest, there descended a small avalanche of dust, and the cobwebs stretched and broke as I pushed the doors back. The case contained a few old pamphlets, all of the same grimy hue. Out of curiosity I removed the dust from three of them to note the titles, but I did not take them away; that was a job for the church cleaners.

Three years later I found those three grimy pamphlets just as I had left them.

Such neglect is incomprehensible; it not only places an impediment in the way of grace (for it is surely unquestionable that a well-tended C.T.S. pamphlet case is a means of grace to many), but it also argues a strange disregard for the proper care of the church, for my discovery proved that at least that part of the home of the Blessed Sacrament had not been cleaned for over three years.

These are a few outstanding examples of how a pamphlet case should *not* be run; unfortunately, there are scores of churches where, though not so neglected as in the instances I have referred to, the pamphlet case is allowed to become a poor advertisement for the Faith and for the particular church where it is allowed to languish uncared for. Two years ago at a C.T.S. meeting, the Archbishop of Birmingham remarked that the state of the C.T.S. pamphlet case in any church is a good indication of the state of the spiritual life of that parish. Where is the apostolic zeal; the effort to combat indifference, ignorance and leakage; to convert England to the Faith, where the C.T.S. pamphlet is regarded as so much waste paper?

So much for those churches where the C.T.S. pamphlet case is, but had far better *not be*, so long as it is allowed to remain neglected, useless for its purpose, a bad advertisement for all concerned.

But there are, almost incredible though it may seem, still some churches where a pamphlet case has never been installed and where those remarkable C.T.S. publications have never been given any sort of chance to do their splendid work for souls.

Perhaps the classic instance of this strange attitude towards the Society and its work is that provided by the parish priest of a certain town—not to be further specified, for we desire not to shame but to convert him—who has placed it on record that he can “preach the truth from his pulpit without the interference of the Catholic Truth Society.” We will leave this good Father to the solitary enjoyment of his own poor jest without comment, and proceed to the more numerous class of objectors who argue that there is no use for a pamphlet case in their church because the people “don’t read.” To these I am tempted to retort: “How do you know if you have never tried?” These objectors I have found chiefly in the poorer industrial quarters of the large towns and in small rural parishes. And yet it is in just such places that I have also found some of the most flourishing and profitable cases. I recall seeing, only last summer, the balance sheet of the pamphlet case in a small market town in the south of England, superficially a most unpromising locality. This balance sheet showed that a steady profit had been made ever since the case had been installed, amounting to several pounds in the course of the year. But this case was dressed by the zealous Box-tender *daily*; furthermore, it was supported by frequent well-timed and appropriate references from the pulpit. The results of this admirable co-operation were reflected not only in the money profits derived from the steady sale of pamphlets, but also—what is infinitely more important and significant—in the equally steady flow of inquiring non-Catholics calling at the presbytery and placing themselves under instruction.

And if people do not read, how is one to account for the steady increase in net sales of the Society’s publications, year after year, in bad times as well as in good, so that from 589,000 in 1923 they reached the truly impressive figure of 1,331,311 in 1933? An already very fine total, more than doubled in the last ten difficult years!

The fact is, surely, that in *every* parish there are *some* people who will buy pamphlets and read them if they are given the opportunity; if they have their attention directed to appropriate and seasonable publications, and if the case is kept well stocked and attractive.

At this year’s Annual General Meeting of the Society, the Bishop of Northampton gave a noteworthy lead by stating that he was going to make it his business to see that during this year of the Society’s Jubilee every church in his diocese

would have a properly run C.T.S. pamphlet case. And the President, the Cardinal Archbishop, signalized the same occasion by announcing that November 4th next is to be observed as C.T.S. Sunday in all the churches of England and Wales, when by authority of the bishops special reference to the Society's work will be made from every pulpit in the land.

There is only one way, I fancy, whereby a preacher, obeying the behest of his bishop and making, on November 4th next, a laudatory reference to the wonderful work of the Catholic Truth Society, whilst all the time conscious that he has never hitherto encouraged it, can avoid embarrassment *coram populo*, and that is by writing *now* to the Society for particulars about their Church Door Pamphlet Cases and their special Jubilee offer. The present terms, both for cases and pamphlets (of which a liberal supply is offered *free* with all new installations) are such that no church can claim that it cannot afford to start one. Indeed, the C.T.S. case has become such an admitted and essential part of a church's equipment in this country that it would be truer to say that no church can afford to be without one.

There are, at the moment of writing, two cathedrals and at least a dozen churches known to me in different parts of England where, were I uncharitably disposed, I should very much like to be on November 4th next. The London church where the C.T.S. case is denied admittance to the church porch on the curious and surely unique ground that its presence there would be an infringement of Canon Law will be an extremely interesting church on C.T.S. Sunday.

With so many modern influences altogether adverse to religion, we know only too well that the Church in England has a tremendously difficult task to hold her own, let alone to make any considerable headway. Accordingly, the words of the Cardinal: "There is now greater need than ever for the work of the Catholic Truth Society," are as true to-day as when they were spoken some years ago, and probably more significant, for the anti-God forces grow and extend their activities year by year. There is not a corner of England where we are not face to face with the enemies of the Church, of which not the least is the spirit of indifference; at the same time there is not a house or cottage that does not contain a potential recruit to the cause of Christ, and in these critical days we cannot afford to overlook the powerful armoury offered by the Catholic Truth Society, whether it be for defence or attack.

C.T.S. Sunday will certainly mark a red-letter day in the annals of the Church in this country if it heralds the attainment of the Society's great ambition: A well-stocked, properly-tended Pamphlet Case in every church throughout the country.

And there is really no reason at all why it should not.

O.S.

*Palma de Mallorca*¹

THE dream-like ships drift in, drift out
Upon a silken sea,
A thousand almond trees in bloom—
Oh dream-like mystery!

And there the sharp transparent hills,
Beauty that never dies;
And here the Rock, the Fort of God,
The Stones of Sacrifice.

For, seven hundred years ago,
Came James, Conquistador,
With fiery Spain behind, in prayer,
And Moorish foes before,

And upright on his galley's prow,
Stern in her might came She,
The stainless Mother of Christ, upon
The ever-virgin sea.

Then, his corrupt eyes turned from hers,
Spear shaking in his hand—
His curvèd moon ran fire, ran blood—
Mahomet bit the sand.

So there they built the Fortress-Church
For James, Conquistador,
The armed hills lie all behind,
The silken sea before.

And still She reigns in Palma town,
As almond-blossom sweet,
The Sun's gold mantle round her cast,
The Crescent 'neath her feet.

M. G. CHADWICK.

¹ James I of Spain, "El Conquistador," landed in Majorca, September, 1229, and, in a series of battles, won the Island from the Moors.

ALLEN AND DEVENTER

(1587)

IN the list of English martyrs whose Cause was submitted to Rome a few years ago, is found the name of Roger Ashton, a layman, who was put to death at Tyburn on June 23, 1592. Owing, however, to some doubt as to the predominant motive for his execution, his case was postponed for further investigation. The earliest documents connected with him, though they mention his being captured carrying a dispensation from the Pope for his "marrying of a gentlewoman nere of kindred unto him," lay stress, rather, on his being intimate with Sir William Stanley at the time of the latter's surrender of Deventer to the Spaniards, and on his causing Allen to write a pamphlet in defence of Stanley's action.¹ At his trial in June, 1592, the Crown lawyers, in their indictment, make no reference to the Papal marriage-dispensation, but with the recklessness then customary in such proceedings, accuse him of various treasonable acts, such as endeavouring to raise rebellion both at home and abroad, and conspiring to dethrone Elizabeth and even to accomplish her death. With this end in view, the indictment continues, he aided Stanley to surrender Deventer to the Duke of Parma, held traitorous conversation with Allen in Rome, later received and circulated Allen's "traitorous books," entered the service of Philip II and accepted a pension from him.²

No proof was forthcoming that Ashton ever endeavoured to raise rebellion in England or that he plotted against the Queen's life. He himself, whilst confessing that he had a pension from the King of Spain, denied that he had been a "principal actor in the delivery of Deventer," or that he had ever practised treason.³ His real offence, it would seem, was his acting as an officer under Stanley in the surrender of the Dutch town and his connexion with Allen's pamphlet in defence of Stanley.

¹ "Tower Prisoners," Dom. Eliz., ccvi, n. 76 and ccxv, n. 19, printed in "Catholic Record Society," ii, pp. 280, 281. Order for Ashton's racking, January 14, 1587—1588, Dasent, "Acts of the Privy Council," xv, p. 335. Order to take proceedings against Richard and William Ashton, March 14, 1590, *ibid.*, xx, p. 356.

² R.O., "Ancient Indictments," 680, m. 2.

³ Verstegan to Persons, August, 1592: "C.R.S.", v, p. 211.

What were the circumstances that led to that surrender? It will be remembered that Queen Elizabeth, who for some time had secretly helped the Calvinist rebels in the Netherlands against the King of Spain, consented in August, 1585, to come to their aid openly. She was reluctant, indeed, to adopt such a course, for she was loth to appear as abetting rebels and feared, moreover, the expense which such a policy might involve; but she was persuaded thereto by the plea of Walsingham that her own safety and that of England depended on keeping Philip II embroiled in the Low Countries. In the December following, Leicester was sent to the Netherlands to take command of the English forces, and within a few weeks, contrary to the express instructions of Elizabeth, accepted from the States the position of Governor General with absolute authority. It is unnecessary here to dilate on Leicester's conduct of affairs, which, indeed, showed plainly that he was quite unsuited for supreme command, either as civil Governor or as military leader. Suffice it to say that, in September, 1586, the English troops captured one of the "sconces," or block-houses, of Zutphen, a force of soldiers under Rowland York being left to defend it, and in October Sir William Pelham and Sir William Stanley by stratagem took possession of Deventer, at that time one of the most flourishing commercial centres of the Netherlands, situated about five miles from Zutphen. Here Stanley was placed in command with a garrison of soldiers, most of whom he had recently recruited in Ireland. Leicester, then, late in November, left the country, in spite of the Queen's orders to the contrary, and returned to England. Before he departed, he relinquished the chief executive authority to the Council of State, entrusted the command of the English forces to Sir John Norris, but made Stanley independent of both, empowering him and his soldiers, should he wish, to leave the service of the States.¹

Deventer had not submitted willingly to the English. On the very day that Stanley took possession, a Spanish force from Zutphen, invited by the inhabitants, was to have entered the town. It was only, indeed, its superior strength that pre-

¹ There are several contemporary references to this extraordinary procedure of Leicester. Buckhurst's statement in Cabala, ii, pp. 69, 70. The deposition of Captain Nuiton, January 21, 1587, "For. Cal. Eliz.", Holland, p. 328. Wilkes to Leicester, January 24, 1587, *ibid.*, p. 331. Norris to Burghley, November 17, 1586, and January 21, 1587, *ibid.*, pp. 234, 327. Cf. Strada, "De Bello Belgico," ii, 8, p. 229. Persons, "Manifestation," p. 44.

vented the expulsion of the English garrison.¹ Nor did the possession of Deventer and of the "sconce" of Zutphen prevent the Spaniards, as was intended, from daily victualling the latter town. The English troops, on the other hand, suffered from extreme want. Not a month's pay, Stanley reported in December, had they received since their arrival in the Netherlands, though by January the States were able to forward sufficient money to pay them for half a month.² Food and clothing even were lacking, so that some of the troops perished of cold and hunger.³ The soldiers, in consequence, were extremely discontented and could with difficulty be kept at their posts. Stanley himself desired to have command elsewhere. These conditions and the futility of expecting any effective remedy from the States may have had some influence on his decision; for he appears to have had great consideration for the men who served under him. At all events, on January 18, 1587, he voluntarily yielded Deventer to the Spaniards, Rowland York at the same time surrendering the "sconce" at Zutphen.

According to his own statement, it was his conscience that impelled Stanley to surrender the town to the representative of its lawful ruler, the King of Spain.⁴ He was himself a Catholic; his Irish soldiers were Catholics; most of the inhabitants of Deventer were Catholics. It may quite well have appeared to him anomalous that he should hold the town for Calvinist rebels who persecuted members of his own Faith.⁵ It is easy to sneer and assert that it argued a "somewhat tardy awakening of conscience."⁶ The same might be said of almost anyone who, convinced of his error, acts counter to his former conduct. Parma, at all events, was convinced of the disinterestedness of the English commander; and certainly from a temporal point of view Stanley had nothing to gain by

¹ Ashton to his brother-in-law, Huett, Deventer, December 29, 1586—January 8, 1587, R.O., "S.P. Foreign," Holland, xii, p. 10.

² Stanley to Walsingham, December 25, 1586; Wilkes to Leicester, January 4, 1587, "For. Cal. Eliz.," Holland, pp. 287, 307.

³ York to Council of State, November 30—December 10, 1586; Wilkes to Leicester, December 18, 1586, *ibid.*, pp. 247, 281.

⁴ Ashton to Allen, March 20, 1587, Strada, *op. cit.*, ii, 8, pp. 228, 229. Motley, "The United Netherlands," ii, p. 166.

⁵ Stanley's forces were in the pay of the States, not of Elizabeth. Bruce, "Leicester Correspondence," pp. 186, 230, 250, 259.

⁶ Motley, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 166.

⁷ Parma to Philip II, February 12, 1587, cited by Motley, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 166. According to Heywood, Strada reduces his defence of Stanley to the ridiculous by noting that Parma asked Philip II to reward Stanley's disinterestedness. If so, then it must be equally ridiculous for anyone to ask that the disinterestedness of another should be rewarded.

his action. Motley, indeed, makes much of his supposed vision of a pension from the King of Spain. But apart even from the tardiness and uncertainty of payment in the Low Countries, the possibility of a pension from Philip II, or of employment as an officer in his army, could hardly have appeared to him as due compensation for the certain loss of his estates in England, or for the danger to his wife and children which his action involved.¹ It is curious that historians, who condemn Stanley, have not a word of condemnation for the yielding of Havre to Elizabeth by the Huguenot rebels in 1562, or for Elizabeth's continual support of Scotsmen who were known to be traitors and rebels both to Mary Queen of Scots and to James VI. Nor, in pronouncing judgment on Stanley, should there be passed over what Froude calls the "gigantic treachery" to the States, contemplated some months previously by Leicester and possibly by the Queen herself.²

Some writers, while not excusing Stanley, have imputed the surrender of Deventer to the Jesuits. Heywood, for instance, who edited Allen's "Defence of Stanley,"³ shows not a little skill in the gradual way he leads up to his final statement of the Jesuits' responsibility. He first mentions, purely as a genealogical fact, that Stanley's brother, John, was a Jesuit (p. 11). Twenty pages later, immediately before relating the surrender of the town, he insinuates that the Jesuits were responsible. "The English," he writes, "contributed largely to the Jesuit ranks. . . To the Jesuits Stanley bore a great regard; wyth which order he is exceedingly enchanted and to them wholly subjected." That Heywood quotes from a bitterly hostile tract may be passed over, but he might have mentioned that its author was here speaking of a period subsequent to the surrender, by which time, as will be shown, Stanley had made the acquaintance of English Jesuits.⁴ Having thus carefully prepared his readers, he

¹ His wife and children were arrested in Ireland soon after the surrender of Deventer. Privy Council to the Lord Deputy, January 30, 1587, "Cal. Eliz.," Ireland, p. 250, Dasent, *op. cit.*, xv, pp. 4, 5, 87. Lady Stanley, later, was allowed to retire, or escaped, to the Continent.

² Cf. Froude, xii, pp. 82, 229; Geyl, "The Revolt of the Netherlands," p. 212.

³ For the Chetham Society, 1851. His introduction to Allen's pamphlet, though learned, is extremely biased and at times quite uncritical.

⁴ "The Estate of the English Fugitives," reprinted as an appendix to Sadler's Letters, vols. ii and iii. The tract is generally ascribed to Sir Edward Lewkenor, and was first given to the public in 1595. Three more editions were published between 1595-1597. Its statements need to be received with great reserve, for its author was not above mixing fiction with his facts, and notably so in the passage from which Heywood drew his quotation: Sadler, ii, p. 507.

is ready with an explicit statement. "The Jesuits," he writes, "*having won Deventer*, immediately wrote to the Pope, Philip, Parma and Allen, magnifying the importance of the service, and claiming reward, and countenance for Stanley and his regiment" (p. xlv).¹ To be sure, he refers his readers to Strada, a Jesuit writer, as his authority, though his reference—ii. lib. 8.—is a trifle indeterminate, considering that the eighth book of Strada's work contains over a hundred closely-printed pages. Should the student, however, plough through them in the hope of finding confirmation for the statement, it will have been wasted labour; for nowhere does Strada assert that "the Jesuits won Deventer," nor that they immediately wrote to the Pope, Philip, Parma and Allen. *Not once does he mention the Jesuits in connexion with the surrender of Deventer.* It is all fiction on Heywood's part. But what reader would suspect it? Indeed, he has misled other writers on the point. In the "Dictionary of National Biography," referring to the surrender of Deventer, the Rev. Francis Sanders, who would have done better to consult his authorities than follow blindly his guide, compresses into one passage the above scattered references of Heywood to the Jesuits. "*There can be no doubt*," he writes, "that at this period of his life, he (Stanley) was almost entirely under the influence of the Jesuits, of which order his brother John was a member. His conduct was largely applauded by his Jesuit friends. The Society urged his claims for reward and countenance on the Pope, Philip and Parma, while Cardinal Allen published a letter at Antwerp in which he laboured to justify the treason."² Father Taunton, too, is equally convinced of the Jesuits' responsibility for the surrender, for apropos of that event, he writes: "Sir William Stanley belonged to the party of which Parsons was the real head. He was in close communication with the Jesuits."³

Now, not one of the above statements of Heywood is true. There is no record at this period of John Stanley being a member of the Society. Jesuit sources know no such person.⁴ They do, indeed, make mention of an Edward Stanley,

¹ Italics mine.

² "D.N.B.", liv, p. 85. Italics mine. Allen, of course, was not a Cardinal when he wrote his "Defence of Stanley."

³ "History of the Jesuits in England," p. 120. Persons, it may be pointed out, spelt his name with an *e*, not as Taunton spells it, with an *a*.

⁴ I have consulted Jesuit correspondence of the time, early unofficial lists of English Jesuits, the official Catalogues and N. Southwell's "Catalogus Primorum Patrum" (1640, Stonyhurst MSS.), based on records some of which are no longer extant.

who was, quite probably, a brother of Sir William. But this fact will hardly support Heywood's contention of Sir William's association with the Jesuits at the time of the surrender of Deventer, for *Edward became a Jesuit over thirty years after that event.*¹ Nor will the fact that Sir William was at one period associated with the Jesuits, Holt and Persons, support Heywood's assertion, for, as we have said above, he became so only subsequent to the surrender. Holt was not sent to Flanders until 1588, a year after that event²; and it was then that Stanley made his acquaintance, possibly through Holt acting as chaplain to his regiment, as Blessed Henry Walpole did later. With Persons Stanley got into touch when he visited Spain in 1590. Before 1588, there is no trace in the State Papers of any connexion of Stanley with the Jesuits; but in, and after, that year he is not infrequently mentioned in association with Holt and less frequently with Persons. The Jesuit records point to the same conclusion; Stanley's name is occasionally met with in the correspondence of the 'nineties, but never before that date. Heywood, and those who followed him, simply and falsely pre-dated the connexion. Nor is there any record of the Jesuits writing after the surrender, recommending Stanley to the Pope, Philip, Parma and Allen.³ Froude, who had a real talent for discovering Jesuits where they were not, implicates Stanley in the Babington conspiracy, and in this connexion makes him the confidant of the Jesuits in London, in July, 1586. But, as Motley rightly points out, there is little, if any, evidence of value to show that Stanley participated in that plot, and the Jesuits certainly had nothing to do with it.⁴

¹ According to the Catalogue of 1621, Edward was of the county of Chester, was fifty-five years old and had entered the Society two years before, when already a priest. He is the same person, no doubt, as Francis Brereton, *vers* Edward Stanley, who entered the English College, Rome, in 1609, and was ordained by Cardinal Bellarmine on December 21, 1611 (Foley, "Records," vi, p. 254). That Edward, the Jesuit, had formerly been a soldier is known from the Chronicle of St. Monica's at Louvain, where he was stationed in 1622 (Catalogue of 1622. Cf. Morris, "Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers," i, p. 253). He may possibly be identified with the Edward Stanley who was a lieutenant under Sir William in 1586, and earned the praises of Leicester for his bravery at Zutphen (Bruce, *op. cit.*, p. 427). This Zutphen Edward is considered to have been a younger brother of Sir William by the Editors of the "Foreign Calendar Elizabeth," Holland.

² Aquaviva to Parma, February 22, 1588, "Archiv. S.J.," Roman, Reg. Fland.-Belg. Ep. Gen., 1577-1610. Aquaviva to Holt, June 26, 1588, *ibid.*, Ep. Gen. ad Fland.

³ "... as though the only naming of a Jesuite (though they had no part at all therein nor were pryvy or consenting to it as in this of S. William Stanleys they were not nor could be) were sufficient to condemne both the act and them," Persons, "Manifestation," p. 44.

⁴ Cf. Morris, "The Letter-Books of Sir Amias Poulet," p. 143.

The surrender of Deventer caused not a little stir. The subject was much discussed and the arguments for and against were many and various. Zealous Catholics defended it: Calvinists denounced it, calling Stanley and his men traitors, rebels, perjurers and the like. Hearing this diversity of opinions, some of those who took part in it were perplexed and anxious. Ashton, therefore, wrote to Allen, asking him to take upon himself the defence of their honour, so that by his arguments the conscience of those who hesitated might remain satisfied.¹

Allen replied by setting forth in a long letter the opinion which he had already expressed to Stanley. Not only is the yielding of such towns held by the English troops under Dutch commission, lawful, but

it is necessary to be done under paine of mortal sinne, and damnation. The cause is, for that everie thing wrongfully obtayned, and unjustly detayned from the true owneres, . . . according to al divine, and humane lawes, and by the very rule of nature, ought to be restored to them, to whom they duly pertayne. [And] so the old holie fathers, and al the latter schoole Doctors, agreeably to the Scriptures, and the civil and canon lawes, determine restitution to be specially necessarie, of al thinges wrongfully obtayned in warres; whether the warres be lawful, or unlawful. . .

But where the warre is wholly, and plainlie unlawful, denounced, and waged without just cause, yea evidently against right and reason, and so knowne to be to men of understanding, and to the soldiars them selves: . . . then everie one that serveth in those warres, doth sinne mortally; and al and everie one bound to satisfaction, and restitution, for what soever annoyance is done, by the said unlawful armes, to the Prince and people, to whom the injurie is done. Neither doth the Sovereignes authoritie, and commandment, excuse the souldiars, or subjectes, who cannot in conscience, nor may not, be executors by their service, of the Princes knowne iniquitie. Owing ever obedience to God more then to any man: though where the injustice of the warres were

¹ The letter was printed with Allen's pamphlet, but is missing from the copy in the British Museum. It is signed R.A., and as these are the initials of Roger Ashton, who was the friend of Stanley, and was serving under him at the time, it has reasonably been ascribed to him. The English Government evidently took it for granted that it was his.

not so assuredly knowne to the subjectes, they might upon their Princes warrant, and commandment serve in the same.

But nowe that the warres of the lowe countries, on the English part be most unjust, not only such as be in conscience Catholike, . . . doe most certainlie see: but even those also which are not wel instructed in Religion, endued only with good nature, reason, and civil honestie, must needes confesse. [For] 1. the Quene of England, as al the wourld knoweth, can make no just claime to Holland, Zealand, or any of those partes, which by armes, she hath seized on: al those provinces being confessed to be his Catholike Majesties auncient, and undoubtful inheritance: therfore every way, she can have no pretence to invade those countries. 2. The defence of the Kings rebelles, against their most just Lord, and Sovereigne, is no lawful, nor honourable quarel of warres; neither have the said Traytours, and rebelles any authoritie, to yield up their Sovereignes townes, and portes, into his enimies handes, or themselves to the English protection or subjection. 3. Rebelles against their lawful powers, be not properly the confoederates or Socii, of anie Prince, or common wealth, that for their defence armes may be taken. 4. The kinges Majestie hath done to the Quene or her realme, no such injuries, for redresse, or revenge whereof, she should by hostilitie, enter into his Dominions, and surprise his townes, and castles, and bring his people into her subjection. Neither these causes, nor any other pretenses being sufficient to make her warre lawful, but al plaine proofes, of most unjust quarel, it must needes be evident to eche reasonable man, of what sense in Religion so ever he be, following only moral vertue, and the lawe of nature, and nations, that as wel this warre by land in the lowe countries, as that other by seas, be nothing elles but a publike robbrie and pyracie. . . And therfore to any gentleman, or souldiar, that standeth upon his honour, . . . it must needes be a great disgrace, to serve in such publike robberies, either by sea, or land. . . Which I say to al noble Capitaines, or souldiars, of what Religion soever they be, who may easely perceive, by conference of our old English honorable denounced warres, with these of our dayes. None other having benne waged by our

countrie, these thirtie yeares almost, then in the cloke of amitie, to surprise the townes, and countries, of their freindes, and confederates : and for the defence, and encouragement of detestable rebelles, against their lawful annoiuted Kinges.

As soone as the Scottes rebelled, against their Quene, the English joyned their forces, to the utter ruine, and destruction, of both her and her Dominion. They rebel against their Kinges in Fraunce : our English helpes and armes, were straight readie, to succour them, and to seaze upon the strong places, of that land, in their owen, or the rebelles, behalfe. They rise in the lowe countries, and in other partes of the wourlde, against the justest powre that can be : and immediately (as though our countrie were ordayned, to be the buckler of al rebellion, injustice, and an enemie of lawful Dominion, and Superioritie,) the Quene thincketh it honorable, or needful, to protect the said rebelles, & to assayle with the wicked traitours, and seditious persons, the oldest, faithfulllest, and greatest confoederate, that ever our realme had.

Allen was evidently no upholder of the exaggerated nationalism, embodied in the phrase, "my country, right or wrong." Such plain-speaking must have been very distasteful to the members of the English Government, not only because it happened to be the truth, but because it coincided with Elizabeth's own earlier declarations and with her known dislike of abetting rebels, or, at least, of appearing publicly as doing so. The concern of the Government may be surmised by a letter from the Council to the Lords Lieutenants of the counties, directing them to give publicity to a pamphlet, written in answer to Allen's tract.¹

Such arguments as the above, Allen considers may be used with Protestants, though he clearly recognizes that some of his nation, councillors included, may have so swept aside all moral considerations, and regard "for the ould honour, rule and discipline of chivalrie," that "to deale with such either by humane, or Divine lawes, were *cum ratione insanire* (to be madde with reason) as the Poete said." For Catholics he urges another consideration, namely, that the war "is waged

¹ "Cal. Dom. Eliz.", 1581-1590, No. 70, p. 141. The counter pamphlet was "A Briefe Discoverie of Doctor Allens Seditious Drifts . . . concerning the Yeelding of Deventer," by G.D., which was printed in London in 1588.

for the defence of haeresie and haeretics and for the eversion of the Catholic faith; that is to say, directly against God, and his holy Church." Finally, he adds the argument from excommunication, supports it by canons of Gregory VII and Urban II, illustrates his points from Scripture and from English history, and concludes by exhorting Catholics to serve under Parma rather than under such a man as Leicester.

This letter to Ashton, it hardly seems doubtful, Allen from the first intended to be published: its formal character suggests it, nor would a merely private letter have served the purpose for which he had been asked to write. Topcliffe, however, assigned the responsibility for printing it to Thomas Worthington,¹ who was later President of Douay, and to him also the crown lawyers imputed, if not the printing of it, at least its circulation.² This may be mere surmise, based on Worthington's later association with Stanley; for at the end of April, 1587, at the latter's request for a chaplain for his regiment, he was sent from Rheims by Allen to take up that post.³ In any case, whether Worthington was responsible or not, he would hardly have published it without authorization from Allen.⁴

One modern author, indeed, Taunton, boldly denies that Allen wrote the pamphlet. That the introductory letter of Ashton is addressed to Allen, that the answering tract is signed and dated by Allen at Rome, that the Spanish ambassador there explicitly recognized it to be Allen's,⁵ that the English Government never doubted Allen to be the author, and that all contemporary writers agreed that it was Allen's; all this is apparently of no consequence. The internal evidence is too strong. "Judging from the style and bitterness," writes Taunton, "we have no hesitation in saying it was the

¹ R.O., "Dom. Eliz.", vol. 235, No. 8.

² Ashton's indictment, *ut supra*.

³ Ashton to Allen, March 20, 1587, Knox, "Douay Diaries," p. 215.

⁴ Allen's "Defence of Stanley" was printed at Antwerp in 1587, by Joachim Troгнаesius. In this edition Ashton's letter was dated March 20th, and Allen's answer April 23, 1587. According to G.D. in his "Briefve Discoverie of Allen's Seditious Drifts" (A. 3. v.), there was another English edition, without name or place, which gave the date of Ashton's letter as May 20th, and that of Allen's answer as July 20th. In 1588, there appeared a French translation of it at Paris, and an Italian version by Andrew Wise at Florence. Dodd mentions a Latin edition printed at Cracow in the same year. Amongst the manuscripts of Hermingham Hall, Suffolk, is listed "a commentarie or explication of a letter written by Cardinal Allen in defense of Sir William Stanley's act of betraying Deventer," "Hist. MSS. Comm.", First Report, p. 61, col. 1.

⁵ Olivares to Philip II, June 12, 1587, "Spanish Calendar," 1587-1603, p. 100.

work of Robert Parsons and that Allen's name was used in accordance with the wish of those who reserved to themselves the right to decide under whose name political works should appear."¹ This, no doubt, is higher criticism. But one may be forgiven for not being altogether convinced by it. It never seems to have occurred to the writer that Allen was hardly such a weakling as to lend his name to a tract, of the "bitterness" of which, on Taunton's supposition, he must have thoroughly disapproved. Nor does such an opinion show any real grasp of Allen's mentality.²

Yet, at first sight, it might seem to receive confirmation from a contemporary source. In his edition of Allen's correspondence, Knox has printed from the Jesuit Grene's "Collectanea," a letter of Oct. 23rd (1587?), objecting strongly to Allen's pamphlet and introducing a reply to it, said to be written by the chief Catholics of England.³ The letter is addressed to Persons and purports to be written by a Jesuit in England who signs himself S.T. In it the writer throws doubt on Allen's authorship of the Deventer pamphlet. "Most of us," he writes, "resolved yt Allen would never have overshott himself so fowly in these times contrary to his former wrytings and protestations and yt it was not unlike some malicious man to make our cause odious to the world to have published this book under the name of Mr. Allen." Both Grene and Knox took this letter and tract seriously. Pollen, however, showed greater critical faculty. The alphabetical sequence of the letters S.T. seemed to him suspicious: there was, moreover, no Jesuit in England at that date with such initials: finally, a comparison of the letter with the genuine correspondence of the Jesuits of that time convinced him that the letter and tract were spurious. He suggested that their real author was the

¹ Taunton, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

² Instances of what Taunton would describe as "bitterness" can be found in Allen's correspondence, as in the expressions he used when writing of Elizabeth. Cf. Allen to Como, April 24, 1582; Allen to Philip II, March 11 and 30, 1587, Knox, "Allen," pp. 131, 272, 286. Cf. also Allen to Parma, August 7, 1588, Naples, Archivio di Stato, Carte Farnesiane, fasc. 760. That Allen thoroughly approved of Stanley's action is shown by his letter to Sixtus V, March or April, 1587, Knox, *ibid.*, p. 289.

³ Grene, "Collectanea P.", p. 329 (Stonyhurst MSS.); Knox, "Allen," p. 299.

⁴ According to Taunton (*op. cit.*, p. 121, note), the writer of the letter "is probably Thomas Stanney a secular priest who in 1587 joined the Society." This is rather typical of Taunton's critical method. T.S. is not S.T. The date of Stanney's entrance into the Society is pure invention. As a matter of fact, he became a Jesuit at Brussels on April 11, 1589, some eighteen months after the date of the above letter. Southwell, "Catalogus Primorum Patrum" (Stonyhurst MSS.).

notorious Gilbert Gifford, the "agent provocateur" of Walsingham in the Babington Plot. Such deception on Gifford's part would be quite in keeping with his character and practice. That he wrote an answer to Allen's pamphlet is known from a letter of Henry Cæsar from Paris, December 9, 1588, as well as from other sources. "Gifford, a little before his taking," Cæsar informs Walsingham, "did write a book against Allen's book which was made in defence and maintenance of Sir William Stanley's fact in delivering up of Deventer into the Spanish hands."¹ "A little before his taking," agrees well with the date of the letter and tract above, October 23, 1587; for Gifford was arrested in Paris in the December of that year.²

It is a testimony to Pollen's critical faculty, that though he overlooked or did not know of one decisive piece of evidence, his conclusions, deduced from the facts above narrated, were right in every detail. Gifford was certainly the author both of the letter and of the tract, printed by Knox: they are identical, as the following facts will show, with the book, written by him against Allen's pamphlet, which Cæsar mentioned in his already quoted report to Walsingham. This book eventually came into the hands of Allen and Persons in Rome. They refer to it in their "*Notata contra Giffordium*," and recognize Gifford to be its author from his letter to Pheippes, November 27, 1587, as well as from other evidence.³ Like the tract printed in Knox, the actual answer to Allen is prefaced by a letter. In his "*Briefe Apologie*" Persons again refers to the book, citing the first sentence, "we have tried by experience &" and this sentence is identical with the opening words of the Knox tract.⁴

Not only, however, is the tract with its prefatory letter written by Gifford, but so far is it from supporting the opinion against Allen's authorship of the Deventer pamphlet, that it affords evidence to the contrary. It is true that this cannot now be proved directly from the tract itself, for the only portion of it extant is the page printed by Knox. But it is known indirectly from the testimony of Allen and Persons themselves. In their "*Notata contra Giffordium*" they assert that

¹ "Dom. Eliz.," Add. xxx, No. 120, printed by Morris, "Letter-Books of Sir Amias Poulet," p. 386.

² The above is summarized from an unpublished manuscript of the late Father J. H. Pollen, S.J.

³ "*Notata contra Giffordium*," Simancas, "Secretario de Estado," Leg. 950, fol. 114. Cf. Persons, "*Briefe Apologie*," p. 4v.

⁴ "*Briefe Apologie*," p. 30v.

though in the preface, *i.e.*, the introductory letter, Gifford appears to be unwilling to believe that Allen is the author, yet as he could not in fact disbelieve it, so he implies Allen's authorship in several places of the tract itself, and they go on to give instances.¹ This piece of evidence, it may be added, besides demonstrating Gifford's real opinion as to the authorship of the Deventer pamphlet, affords equivalently an explicit acknowledgment by Allen that he himself was its author.

It was to be expected that the Appellant priests at the end of the century would not look with favour on Allen's pamphlet; for its principles and assertions run quite counter to their own writings. Though, however, they openly and strongly disapprove of it, they do not deny that Allen wrote it, but endeavour to excuse him by asserting that he was overpersuaded by Persons to do so.² But, as I have already shown elsewhere, they persistently presented a false picture of Allen which has been perpetuated by later writers of an anti-Jesuit bias.³ In these days, with the knowledge of Allen, obtainable from his books and correspondence, not all of which has yet been published, to assert that he was himself incapable of writing the "Defence of Stanley" is the negation of criticism.

LEO HICKS.

¹ The "Notata contra Giffordium" was drawn up by Allen and Persons, so Olivares reports, and presented to him to be sent on to Philip II. Olivares to Philip II, Rome, June 13, 1588, Simancas, "Secretario de Estado," Leg. 950, fol. 114.

² "Important Considerations," p. 22. For Persons's comment on this assertion, cf. his "Manifestation," pp. 34v and 46. Persons defended Stanley's action and Allen's pamphlet. Butler ("Historical Memoirs of Catholics," lii, p. 228) repeats the Appellants' assertion.

³ Cf. "Cardinal Allen and the Society of Jesus," *THE MONTH*, October, November, December, 1932, and "The English College, Rome, and Vocations to the Society of Jesus, 1579-1595," *Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu*, January, 1934.

THE NOVENA

"I DON'T want to be sentimental about this," said the visitor, and his grey face grew even more repressed at the mere idea. "I am not a sentimental man."

"Gregory Roth," Father Bottrill read from the card. "No, not a sentimental man."

One did not have to know such a money magnate. His reputation was forced upon one by every paper that fawned upon or railed at tight-fisted wealth. Pity was a vice to such a man.

"I'm really wondering why you visit me?" the priest asked.

He was more than wondering. He was thinking it unique. He gazed out of his windows at the row of small villas that made up his district. There was no abject poverty here to salve a conscience (if any); nor wealth to suggest business advantages. Just a humdrum suburban dormitory, existing in reasonable comfort between the upper millstone of Income Tax and the nether one of the Dole. The sort of neighbourhood where even death was an inevitable convention in a placid life rather than a tragedy.

"Have you a man named Hyden among your parishioners?" was all the millionaire said.

"Lawrence Hyden, you mean?" Father Bottrill asked in surprise. "Lives at Coniston, Woodfold Gardens?"

Gregory Roth's grimness seemed to tighten up at Bottrill's recognition of the name. But all he said was: "Tell me about him."

"Unusual," the priest objected.

"I'll tell you about it if he's the man," Gregory Roth said.

"You don't know him then? Or—what is it?"

"You'll see later. Tell me about him. It's quite all right."

"What do you want to know? I mean, there's nothing much to tell. He's a very ordinary person."

"Everything about him. He has a family?"

"A big family. Six. Only one a boy. And all very young. . ."

"And the youngest girls no more than babies," Gregory Roth put in.

"You know?" said Father Bottrill. "But—"

"Go on," said the millionaire, queer, but his face looked greyer. "What's his position? . . . That sort of thing."

"What is there to say? He—his family—even his circumstances are very ordinary. I mean, the whole neighbourhood is made up of Hydens. Men of about forty, going to the City every day . . . some sort of higher clerical job, or little firm of their own, you know. The only difference is, he hasn't a 'Baby' car, has too many human babies for that, I suppose."

He paused, expecting some response to his small quip. But Gregory Roth either didn't know the suburbs or wasn't in the mood for jokes, small or large. Father Bottrill went on with a sigh: "It really is difficult to say much. He's not a bad chap, Hyden—probably a very decent chap if one knew him well, but one can't know them all well. . . . So many of them . . . so similar. His kids seem jolly. . . . Yes, he looks after them well, careful about schools and clothes and so on . . . but then, they're all like that. . . . The house, one in a road of semi-detached villas. Well-kept, but again, they all are. There's a solid self-respect in such people that keeps things decent. And. . . . What more can I say? I don't know. He's just one in a multitude."

Gregory Roth stared at him with tightened lips, then said with reluctance:

"Hard up?"

"Eh?" blinked Father Bottrill. "What makes you ask?"

"Is he?"

"I simply don't know," the priest said. "I've seen no sign of it. Not that that means anything. Most about here have been hit by the financial depression; only, well, they're not the kind to show it. It's a sort of pluck they have—just tighten up the belt but make no outward show, you know."

"Hmm!" mumbled Gregory Roth.

"I assure you it's a fact," Father Bottrill said, as though he'd been doubted. "I can tell you case after case of real distress never exposed. . . ."

"Quite. But I'm only concerned with Hyden. You don't know whether he's hard up? Not even though he has six children?"

"He's less likely to show it, with six children. He'd keep it from them . . . afraid of spoiling their *morale*, you see. He'd show an even braver face to the world for the sake of those children. You understand what I mean?"

"No. But I can follow your argument. So you don't know. Do you know if he's ill?"

"Ill?" Father Bottrill wondered what the man was driving at. "I don't think he is."

"But do you *know*?"

"Well, I should say he isn't. He still goes daily to the City, as a matter of fact. I met him only yesterday."

"And that means nothing," Gregory Roth said. "The type you describe would still go to the City though they were dying—if they could."

"Why, yes, I think you're right there," the priest agreed. "They'd go on as long as they could stand on their feet—for the sake of their families." He stared hard at the millionaire. "Do you mean Hyden's like that?"

"I believe he is," Gregory Roth said, and again he seemed reluctant.

"You mean—I say, do you employ Hyden?"

"No. I neither know of, nor have met the man," the millionaire said, as though the mere suggestion of such a connexion was an affront.

Father Bottrill could only stare bewildered.

The millionaire sat eyeing him firmly and coldly, wondering, it seemed, if the priest would dare to think him a fool. He said after a bleak, discouraging moment:

"I suppose you're one of those who believe in prayer?"

"My cloth would argue it," the priest smiled. "But even apart from that, I do—personally. Many people do."

"I don't," the millionaire said. His tone left no doubt about his general opinion of such rubbish. "And that's what makes it so—odd."

He saw a quickening in Father Bottrill's eyes, said cuttingly:

"Look here. I won't have you think I've gone soft. I haven't. It's only because the thing's a nuisance. But you'd better have the hard facts. Perhaps you noticed a week or so ago I figured in the news? An industrial merger. The Sunday papers were ridiculous about it."

"Seventy millions made in a single deal—wasn't that it?"

"An absurd exaggeration," the man snapped. "Still, there was a deal and I made a lot of money. The Sunday papers had their front pages full of it. And on Sunday afternoon this infernal thing began."

"This thing connected with Hyden?"

"I didn't know he was Hyden then. Just a man who— who got into my—my thoughts." He looked at the priest ready to glare down a smile. "I was resting in the afternoon. I generally do—sitting back thinking things out. Most fruitful—usually. What I mean, you mustn't think I was asleep. I never sleep in the day—what's the night for? Well, I was sitting like that, thinking over this coup of mine, naturally. Then I realized I was with another man who was also thinking of it."

"With?"

"I can't attempt to explain. The thing's too unspecific and absurd. It seemed this—I was sitting back in my chair, and he was sitting back in his—somewhere, in some other house, only somehow we were together, because, I suppose, we were thinking of the same thing. A Sunday newspaper lay across his knees. He had read of my coup and was envying me."

"Envy? I thought you said prayer was in this?"

"Well, I won't say envy then. No, not envy, because the man was in agony. His actual thoughts were, as I felt them, 'If I only had a fraction of that money. Only a fraction. It would save the kids. Dying wouldn't be so fearful then.' " He glared at Father Bottrill. "If you expect me to give any more explanation than that, you're not going to get it. You must take it from me that the thing wasn't a dream, that I had an actual sense of its being real. I'm not going to enter into any argument about the psychic. . ."

"That's all right," said the priest. "I'm really more worried about your word 'dying.' If this was Hyden, how do you know? You see, it's the first I've heard of it, for as I say I met him yesterday. And even as far as his wife and family go—well, I'm pretty confident they don't know either."

"I knew," Gregory Roth frowned. "I don't know how I knew—from his mind, I take it. But I knew, definitely, that he had been to a specialist during the week, that he had been told that he had an incurable growth, and that he had—*has*—only a few months to live." He frowned. "Believe me, I have no doubts about it—that is, unless you are going to prove me wrong. In this—er—experience the man sat in terrible agony, worrying about his wife, worrying about his children, wondering what would become of them when he was dead."

"And wishing he had only a fraction of the coup you had just made to make their security a certainty," the priest said.

"Yes," the millionaire frowned. "That's—that's how he fastened on me, I suppose. Seemed wrong to him that I should have so much, when he was in such dire straits. He'd been losing in business. A small business, hit by the slump. He'd been making do on his savings. Draining himself to keep family and office going, and now, when most of those savings had gone, he was going to die. The family he'd reared educated to live comfortably would have nothing. Their future tortured him."

"Poor fellow—six children. Five girls, too," Father Bottrill mused. "He's brought them up with such hope. No wonder he prayed for a fraction of your success."

"Prayed?" Gregory Roth snapped agnostically.

"*Something* brought you here," Father Bottrill said gently.

"Well, if you like—he prayed. He'd been doing it off and on even as he sat thinking of me, wishing he had a fraction of my money, and after a time he also went over to the corner of the room and knelt down before a picture of a woman."

"A picture of Our Lady?"

"Eh? The Virgin Mary? No, it wasn't her. Someone younger. He prayed for an hour. All his dread of the poverty and the future of his children in it. It was terrible."

"You heard his prayer?" demanded Father Bottrill.

"I couldn't help it. I couldn't get my mind away from him," Gregory Roth said petulantly. "Haven't been able to get it away for the last nine days."

"A novena," the priest tried to explain.

"I don't know what that means," the millionaire said, and then his frayed nerves made him suddenly fluent. "But the fellow has been at me all the time. Yes, every day, sometimes three or four times a day, the experience is repeated. It catches me not only in the afternoon, but in the oddest hours."

"Men can pray at all hours," Father Bottrill said. "Odd or otherwise."

"Too odd for me," Gregory Roth snapped. "The thing's a—a plague; always getting between me and things of real importance, always holding up before me the fact that I, who had so much money already, had been given so much more, though I have no children, no anxieties, while he who has the anxieties of six children has nothing. As though that put me under some obligation."

"Perhaps it does," the priest said quietly.

"Nonsense," Gregory Roth said. "Finance would be in a pretty queer state if it were run on *those* lines. But I'm not here to argue ethics. I'm here to stop the thing. My nerves won't stand much more of it."

"How?"

"I want you to find out if it's all really true—not a mere—mere fantasy."

"But your curiously close knowledge of Lawrence Hyden convinces me it is true," the priest's eyes twinkled. "Even apart from my quite unscientific belief in prayer. And how did you know it *was* Hyden, and that he lived in my parish, by the way?"

Gregory Roth frowned for a moment.

"I don't know," he admitted. "Apart from the fact that I seemed to realize his name instinctively, and the district he lived in, and that he was a Catholic—you being the local priest seemed the right person for inquiries."

"It does seem inevitable," the priest smiled. "And you want me to find out if Hyden really is dying and so convince you that the experience is not fantasy all the way through?"

"That wouldn't end it," Gregory Roth said. "I mean, I've got to be rid of the thing. The whole business is absurd, but if the man is dying, if his family *does* face this wreckage, it's plain that I'm never going to get it off my mind unless I do something."

"A fraction of that coup to make his children secure?" said the priest.

"Something like that," Gregory Roth said in defensive tones. "After all, I'm wealthy enough to buy my comfort."

"You want me to see to this? To see Hyden?"

"If you will. Discreetly, of course. I don't want to appear a bigger fool than need be."

Three days later Father Bottrill sat in Gregory Roth's office.

"Your experience was correct," he said. "Lawrence Hyden has received his death sentence. He has only six months left to live. He was startled when I drew it out of him. Not even his wife knows yet. He is too brave to tell her—or perhaps not brave enough."

"And his affairs?"

"As you thought. He leaves his family penniless."

The hard lips tightened.

"How much would safeguard them?"

"He told me he had made a novena for a certain sum," began the priest, and stopped, and looked at the millionaire. Gregory Roth met his look half angrily for a minute, shrugged, took a cheque book from a drawer and wrote.

"Yes, that is the sum he prayed for," Father Bottrill said softly. "Odd how prayers are answered, isn't it?"

"Oh, prayer," said the millionaire. He stood up impatiently to show the priest to the door.

Half-way across the room Father Bottrill paused apologetically. Handed across a picture.

"What's this?" the millionaire snapped. "Oh, the picture of the woman he prayed to. Who is she?"

"A Carmelite Saint," the priest said, "St. Thérèse of Lisieux. We call her 'The Little Flower.'"

Father Bottrill put out his hand for the return of the picture, but Gregory Roth said: "Hmm! Interesting. Do you mind if I keep it?"

Father Bottrill, smiling, left it with him—he had rather hoped he'd have to.

DOUGLAS NEWTON.

Sanguis Christi

WHEN those last, anguished words were said,
On Mary, where she stood
Beneath the Cross, from Jesus dead
There fell a drop of blood.

One drop had made us all to live
Had God so wisely willed,
But spendthrift Love must give and give,—
And all He had He spilled.

On her, all pure or e'er her birth,
That last drop, needless, fell.—
It spread to cover all the earth!
It deepened to a well!

In Mary's hands it grows a sea
Unfathomably deep;
The more of grace she asks for me,
The more she has to keep!

WILLIAM BLISS.

THE LUMINOUS PHENOMENA OF MYSTICISM

THE case of the "luminous woman" of Pirano has recently attracted a certain amount of attention in the English newspapers. Presented at first as a purely pathological abnormality, this manifestation now seems to be attributed, at least in part, to psychological conditions of religious origin. In a communication from Milan which appeared in *The Times* for May 5th, we learn that a cinematograph apparatus has been brought into play, by means of which it has been possible to obtain an exact record of the nature and duration of the luminous appearances. With the aid of the film thus provided Dr. Protti has submitted a provisional report of the case to a medical society connected with the University of Padua. This investigator, we are told, has convinced himself that the woman "has a fixed idea of a religious character," and he also holds that "these fixed ideas can in particular subjects produce profound changes in the vegetative life system." In illustration of this he appeals to the chill resulting from intense fear, to the bleaching of the hair which is sometimes caused by an unforeseen shock, to the emotions which increase the heart beats, to the effect of protracted suffering upon the gastric secretions with those of the thyroid gland, etc. All these things go to show what influence can be exercised by the stimuli which act on the brain in determining changes, sometimes of a lasting nature, in the visceral functions. That some disturbing conditions of this sort are present in the case, seems to the investigator we are quoting, to be a matter beyond dispute. In the words of *The Times* correspondent's report :

These disturbances of the vegetative life in the woman are evident. It is enough to recall that the frequency of her breathing and her heart beats are redoubled when the luminous phenomenon is manifested, after which a heavy perspiration is noted. This increased frequency is probably determined by sudden additions to the blood stream of glandular substances tending to excite these functions. The woman fasted very strictly during Lent, and Dr. Protti attaches much importance to this circum-

stance. The radiant power of her blood is three times the normal, as Dr. Protti was able to verify.

The doctor is, therefore, inclined to believe that, during fasting, conditions are established in the woman favourable to the production of an excess of sulphides, the presence of which is revealed usually by a dark mark left on the skin of those who wear a silver necklace. Sulphides have the property of becoming luminous when they are excited by ultra-violet radiations. As the radiant power of the blood is of an ultra-violet nature and as the woman possesses a very high radiant power, which rises still higher with the increase of the combustions produced by the acceleration of the heart beats, it seems possible to Dr. Protti that the ultra-violet radiation of the blood may excite the sulphides produced in the organism of the woman and thus bring about the periodical luminosity. Dr. Protti holds, therefore, that if it were possible to show that energies of equal intensity to the ultra-violet ones existed in the blood of the woman, it would be possible to believe that a plausible explanation of the luminous phenomenon had been found.

It is rather interesting to compare these remarks with certain comments which occur in the great treatise on Beatification and Canonization of Prosper Lambertini (Pope Benedict XIV). That high authority is quite prepared to attribute to natural causes many of the luminous emanations said to have been witnessed now and again in the case of God's chosen servants. Appealing to the statements made by Gassendi, Conrad Gesner and T. Bartolini, the Pope says: "It seems to be a fact that there are natural flames which at times visibly encircle the human head, and also that from a man's whole person fire may on occasion radiate naturally, not, however, like a flame which streams upwards, but rather in the form of sparks which are given off all round; further, that some people become resplendent with a blaze of light, though this is not inherent in themselves, but attaches rather to their clothes, or to the staff or to the spear which they are carrying."¹ It must be confessed that no very satisfactory evidence is adduced for this. The portents described in the early books of Livy are not exactly convincing as historical sources. Such a modern authority as Dr. E. N. Harvey shows no disposi-

¹ P. Lambertini, "De Beatificatione et Canonizatione," Book IV, part I, chap. 26, n. 21.

tion to admit the existence of any radiant phenomena of this sort. The utmost he seems to recognize in the human subject is "the occasional presence of luminous bacteria in wounds," and the fact that "the skin may sometimes be a source of light, especially after sweating." This, he says, "is due to luminous bacteria upon the accumulations of substances passed out in the sweat which serves as a nutrient medium."¹ But the phosphorescence which results from such causes is very faint and barely perceptible.

In any case, Prosper Lambertini is somewhat chary about admitting isolated cases of such effulgence to be uncontestedly miraculous, though, in view of the recognized holiness of such servants of God as St. Philip Neri, St. Charles Borromeo, St. Ignatius of Loyola, St. Francis of Sales and many more, he does not dispute that the brilliant light which was seen on occasion to surround them when preaching, or when offering the holy sacrifice, was of supernatural origin. It is unquestionably true, as he tells us, that there are hundreds of such examples to be found in our hagiographical records, and although a great number of these rest upon quite insufficient testimony, there are others which cannot lightly be set aside. Some years ago, when writing in these pages on "Levitation," I quoted two illustrations of this last phenomena in which the accompanying blaze of light formed a very impressive element in the experience which the witnesses recounted. As I have met no other instances in which the evidence is equally good, I trust I may be pardoned for referring again to these two striking cases, both belonging to the seventeenth century.

The *processus ordinarius* for the beatification of Blessed Bernardino Realini, who died at Lecce in 1616, was begun in Naples in 1621. Amongst the witnesses examined on that occasion was a certain Signor Tobias da Ponte, a gentleman of rank, whose good standing was made clear by other evidence. He deposed that in the year 1608, or thereabouts, he had come to consult Father Bernardino, but finding his door closed, had waited for some time outside his room. The door, however, was not completely shut, and Signor Tobias noticed an extraordinary radiance which streamed through the slight aperture, and through certain chinks in the boards, all of which set him wondering what could have led the Father to have a fire lighted at midday in the month of April. In his

¹ E. N. Harvey, "The Nature of Animal Light," 1920, pp. 16-17.

curiosity he pushed the door a little further open and then perceived the holy man kneeling rapt in ecstasy and raised in the air a couple of feet or more above the floor. The witness was too awe-stricken to advance further, or even to remain peeping in as a spectator, but he sat down again upon a bench outside and contented himself for a while with watching the light as it issued through the crannies. He described himself as so dazed by what he had seen that when he had more or less recovered from his emotion he decided that the only thing to be done was to return home again. After giving this testimony, Don Tobias was closely cross-examined, but his evidence, given, of course, upon oath, was in no way shaken. He described how he had argued with himself that the radiance must be his own imagination, or that it was caused by some curious reflection of the sunlight outside, but he said that he had only become more convinced that neither of these things was possible. Although no other witness had shared this experience, there was some confirmation provided by the deposition of a certain Father Beatillo, who was able to testify that he had heard the story from Don Tobias several years before.

Even so, one may hesitate to regard the evidence as entirely satisfactory, but it must not be overlooked that quite a number of people bore witness to the extraordinary radiance with which Father Bernardino's countenance was at times transformed. They had not beheld him raised in the air, but some declared that they had seen sparks coming from all over his body like sparks from a fire (*scintillava da tutto il corpo come scintille di fuoco*), and others asserted that the dazzling glow from his countenance on one or two occasions was such that they could not rightly distinguish his features, but had to turn their eyes away. Similarly, a Father in Naples described how, one day, when he had gone to call Father Bernardino in the early morning he found him on his knees and with his face so radiant that it lit up the darkness of the room. There were other witnesses, no doubt, who had lived with him in his later years, and who stated very frankly that they had never themselves seen the radiance spoken of, though they quoted the testimony of several Fathers, no longer living, who had been more privileged. But it must be remembered that Bernardino was eighty-six when he died, and that no official examination of witnesses took place until five years later. Consequently, few could have been in a position to give evi-

dence concerning the period of his more vigorous activity; but they remembered what those who had been his contemporaries declared that they had themselves seen.¹

The case of Father Francis Suarez, the great theologian, depends upon the testimony of only a single witness, but it is in many ways remarkable. A laybrother, Jerome da Silva, who was acting as porter in the Jesuit college at Coimbra, came about 2 o'clock in the afternoon to let Father Suarez know that a distinguished visitor sought to speak with him. A stick placed across the door served to indicate that the Father did not wish to be disturbed, but as the Brother had received instructions that whenever this visitor called he was to inform Father Suarez at once, he pushed on, disregarding the signal, and found the outer room in darkness, the shutters being closed against the afternoon heat. Then the Brother's account goes on :

I called the Father, but he made no answer. As the curtain which shut off his working room was drawn, I saw through the space left between the curtain and the jambs of the door a very great brightness. I pushed aside the curtain and entered the inner apartment. Then I perceived that a blinding light was coming from the crucifix, so intense that it was like the reflexion of the sun from glass windows, and I felt that I could not have remained looking at it without being completely dazzled. This light streamed from the crucifix upon the face and breast of Father Suarez, and in the brightness I saw him in a kneeling position in front of the crucifix, his head uncovered, his hands joined and his body in the air lifted five palms above the floor on a level with the table on which the crucifix stood.²

The Brother then withdrew in great agitation and waited near the door to recover himself. After a quarter of an hour Father Suarez came out, and finding the Brother porter outside asked him why he had not let him know. The Brother explained that he had called him and had come into the inner room, but that there had been no reply. Then Father Suarez, showing much emotion, tried to extort a promise from Brother da Silva that he would say nothing of what he had seen. The

¹ See the "*Summarium super Virtutibus*," reprinted by the Congregation of Sacred Rites in 1828, especially pp. 183, 187, 188, 189, 190, 192-3, and 200—202.

² R. de Scorraile, "*François Suarez*," Vol. II, p. 301.

Brother, in turn, asked him to allow him to consult Father de Morales, who acted as confessor to both of them, and it was then arranged, at the suggestion of the confessor in question, that the Brother should draw up a signed and sealed statement in writing, but with an endorsement on the cover of the document that it was on no account to be opened until after Father Suarez's death. As both the laybrother da Silva, and Father de Morales were themselves held in deep veneration for their well-known holiness of life, it seems to me that this is a piece of evidence which cannot lightly be rejected.

It may be noted, too, that the luminous phenomena connected with holy people take a very great variety of forms. Amongst many others, that wonderful model of patient suffering, St. Lydwina of Schiedam, was famous in this way. Thomas à Kempis who, though not her earliest biographer, has left a seemingly reliable account of the mystical experiences of his compatriot and contemporary, speaks of her as follows :

Apart from her mental illumination, over which great men of letters and religious, versed in spiritual studies . . . wondered exceedingly, very often by day and night when she was visited by the angel, or returned from the contemplation of the things above, she was discovered by her companions to be surrounded by so great a divine brightness, that seeing the splendour and struck with exceeding fear, they dared not approach nigh to her. And although she always lay in darkness and material light was unbearable to her eyes, nevertheless, the divine light was very agreeable to her, whereby her cell was often so wondrously flooded by night, that to the beholders the cell itself appeared full of material lamps or fires. Nor is it strange if she overflowed even in the body with divine brightness, who, according to the expression of Blessed Paul, beholding the glory of the Lord with open face, was daily transformed into the same image from brightness to brightness as by the spirit of the Lord (2 Cor. iii, 18). And not only was she wont to be surrounded by divine brightness, but with a wondrous sweetness also both herself and her cell were found to be redolent, so that those who entered thought that divers aromatic simples had been brought in and scattered there.¹

¹ "St. Lydwine of Schiedam, Virgin," by Thomas à Kempis, translated by Dom Vincent Scully, C.R.L., 1912, p. 117.

It is undoubtedly necessary in most of these cases to scrutinize the evidence narrowly even when it is presented on oath in a process of beatification. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that after the lapse of years many people, without conscious insincerity, do very easily persuade themselves that they have heard, seen or said things which have no better foundation than their own imagination, or their wish to believe.¹ Still, there are not a few cases in which the evidence seems strong, even though the persons so favoured are not Saints widely famous throughout the Church. There can, therefore, be no adequate reason for refusing credence to the report of similar phenomena when they are recorded of those whose eminent holiness and marvellous gifts of grace are universally recognized. The radiance which at times is said to have surrounded St. Philip Neri, St. Catherine de Ricci, St. Francis of Paola, St. Alphonsus Liguori and many more, seems antecedently likely, assuming the fact that such a favour has been bestowed upon other holy people who are less eminent. No doubt it is easy to exaggerate the impression left in such cases. A man who speaks with power and intense conviction is apt to be flushed. His countenance is transformed, his eyes flame, his vehemence seems almost to surround him with a halo. In the very sober *Life of St. Philip Neri*, by the Abbés Ponnelle and Bordet, a biography which possibly pushes the critical spirit somewhat further than is necessary, we find, if I mistake not, no definite mention of the radiance which is said often to have lit up the face of the Apostle of Rome. There is a discussion, of course, of the extraordinary palpitations from which the Saint suffered, of the displacement of his ribs and of the sense of consuming heat which continually attended him, but we hear nothing of the radiant aureole with which, according to his early biographer and friend, Father Bacci, his features were not infrequently glorified.² Moreover, in alluding to the acquaintance of St. Philip with St. Ignatius, the authors say :

Philip was not in the habit of dating his recollections, but he gladly spoke of the impression made upon him by "Father Ignatius of holy memory." "His face," he

¹ For example, I must confess that when Father Bruno, in his "*Life of St. John of the Cross*" (p. 176), tells us that, during the Saint's imprisonment at Toledo, "twice the dungeon was lit up by night as if it were day," I should like better authority than that quoted on p. 426. The sources cited are very late. M. Baruzi, I note, passes the incident over in silence.

² Bacci, "*Vita di San Filippo Neri*" (Firenze, 1851), Book III, cap. 1, nn. 15-19, pp. 207-208.

said, "was all resplendent." Thus did interior perfection show itself to him in the faces of men. He observed the same phenomenon in St. Charles Borromeo, and in the Carthusians of Santa Maria degli Angeli, when they came away from their prayer.

There is no need to suppose that he saw a material aureole, and Philip's words may be understood either of a countenance full of fervour, or of impassioned gestures, such as St. Ignatius made use of in his first sermons in Rome. Did not St. Ignatius himself say in the Constitutions which he drew up in 1539 (*sic*) that "the flame of the spirit and the eyes make more impression upon the masses than elegant discourses and nicely-chosen words"? Wandering about the streets of Rome in search of the things of God, Philip cannot have failed to attend during 1538, the sermons at Santa Maria di Monserrato, when the Spaniard, by his vehemence and his "authority," was carrying off their feet even those of his hearers who did not understand his tongue.¹

This may be so, but I find it rather difficult to believe that St. Philip and those who used similar expressions, not only of St. Ignatius, but of St. Charles and many others, were only speaking metaphorically. There are so many stories of holy priests who lit up a dark cell or a whole chapel by the light which streamed from them or upon them, that I am strongly inclined to adhere to the more literal interpretation. For example, we read of the fourteenth century Carthusian, John Tornerius, then at the Grande Chartreuse near Grenoble, that when his non-arrival in time to celebrate his first Mass, led the sacristan to go to his cell to fetch him, he found the little room radiant with light which seemed to be diffused all round the good Father as if the midday sun was shining there.² Similarly, in the process of beatification of the holy Franciscan Observant, Blessed Thomas da Cori, witnesses stated that the whole church on a dark morning was lit up by the radiance which glowed in the Father's countenance (*che sembrava un sole, il quale tutta quella chiesa luminosa e risplendente rendesse*).³ Further, we learn from what is seemingly the earliest account preserved to us of Blessed Giles of Assisi, that in the night time on one occasion "so great a

¹ Ponnelle and Bordet, "St. Philip Neri" (Eng. Trans.), pp. 100-101.

² Le Couteulx, "Annales Ordinis Carthusiani," Vol. V, p. 468.

³ Lucca di Roma, "Vita del B. Padre Tommaso da Cori," 1786, p. 127.

light shone round him that the light of the moon was wholly eclipsed thereby." ¹ So, again, that the house of Blessed Aleidis of Scarbeke seemed to be on fire when she, with a radiant countenance, was praying within; or, once more, that the cell of St. Lewis Bertrand, as Captain de Betancourt bore witness, "appeared as if the whole room was illuminated with the most powerful lamps." ² And such alleged examples are numerous.

Let me add that the frequent occurrence of luminous phenomena in mediumistic séances—many of these being well attested in circumstances where the strictness of the control seems to preclude the possibility of fraud—strongly inclines me to believe that similar manifestations are not likely to be lacking in the records of mysticism. As the wonders contrived by Pharaoh's magicians followed closely the type of the miracles wrought by Moses and Aaron, so no careful student of psychical research can fail to notice a very close resemblance between the marvels recorded in the lives of the Saints, and the phenomena of what is loosely termed spiritualism. What the connexion is, I am not here concerned to inquire, nor do I believe that we yet possess data enough to be able to deal adequately with the problem. Still less can I venture to express any opinion upon the nature of the luminous phenomena now being investigated in Milan. One can only hope that the scientific inquiry which has been undertaken will yield results which may be helpful as a guide for the psychic researchers of the future.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ W. Seton, "Life of Blessed Giles of Assisi," p. 78.

² "Acta Sanctorum," June, Vol. II, p. 474.

³ Wilberforce, "Life of St. Lewis Bertrand," p. 204.

ANGLICANISM SELF-PORTRAYED

WE Catholics are so convinced of the essential unsoundness of the Anglican ecclesiastical system that we are disposed to welcome every sincere attempt its adherents make to expound it for the information of outsiders, since we feel sure that in this way will be unconsciously exhibited the flaws, logical and historical, which we know *a priori* are there. I say *a priori*, for our faith assures us that there cannot be two contradictory religious systems, which are both fundamentally true. Both, of course, may be false, but here again we are certain, with the certainty of faith, that ours is absolutely true. We have received the gift of faith and, so long as our will co-operates with that grace, we are immune from doubt. No Anglican can have the same objective assurance, for the human intellectual element in his faith is always liable to change: it rests ultimately on his own judgment, or on the authority of others equally fallible. No consistent Catholic can contemplate, as many Anglicans confessedly do,¹ that some addition to knowledge, some alteration of view, some new scientific truth, will compel his abandonment of belief in his Church. If "all Churches have erred," and still may err, the honest man's adhesion to any of them can only be provisional.

Accordingly, we consider it a good thing for well-instructed foreign Catholics to be presented with such a statement of the character and doctrines of Anglicanism as the new Quarterly called *Œcumenica* is professedly intended to provide. We join with the Archbishop of Canterbury in wishing, as he does in his prefatory Message, "*que cette revue représente en toute franchise et vérité notre Eglise d'Angleterre telle qu'elle est, avec toute la richesse de sa pensée théologique et de ses coutumes liturgiques,*" and only venture to emphasize by italics what seems to be most desirable in its purpose. It is because Anglicans have not hitherto furnished to those interested abroad a picture of their Church "*telle qu'elle est,*"

¹ "It is always conceivable that a Protestant Episcopate might take some action, as, for instance, the establishment of general intercommunion with the Nonconformist bodies, which would forfeit the Catholic character of the English Church. In such case English Catholics would almost inevitably be compelled to seek reconciliation with the Holy See." See "The Catholic Movement in the Church of England," by the Rev. Wilfrid Knox (last chapter).

painted "en toute franchise et vérité," that deplorable misapprehensions, conveniently summarized as "Portalism," have existed, and, alas! still exist, in certain Catholic circles on the Continent. This new Quarterly has been kindly sent to us to review, and, therefore, we must presume that its supporters wish to know what reactions it arouses in the minds of British Catholics, and how far we consider that it fulfils the desires of their Archbishop. This we shall try to convey with entire sincerity and courtesy, qualities that are not incompatible: for it is not courteous to withhold, lest he should be hurt, what one's interlocutor wants to know, viz., one's real opinion. An absolutely final judgment on all points is not, of course, as yet possible, since a single issue could not be expected to unfold its whole plan, but enough is shown to give a definite impression. The Review is issued by a body set up in 1933 by the Church Assembly, the "Council for Foreign Relations," and, whilst not claiming to be officially commissioned, does claim to represent the three elements of Catholicity, Evangelicalism and Liberalism which are united in the bosom of its Church, although everywhere else in opposition. In this first issue it would seem that the "Catholic" element is meant to be emphasized, for Dr. Frere, the Bishop of Truro, the only "Anglo-Catholic" diocesan bishop, has a short paper "De Ecclesia," which he rightly considers the most fundamental question of all, and none of the other writers are markedly Protestant. The proof that Anglicanism will be presented *telle qu'elle est* has yet to appear. If, subsequently, Dr. Barnes is allowed to expound the sacramental system of the English Church, and Mr. Major to interpret the Creeds, and Dr. Pollock to deal with State Establishment, and Dean Inge to give *his* views *de Ecclesia*, and the Rev. Spencer Jones or any of the signatories of the famous "Centenary Manifesto" to discuss Liberal Catholicism, then we shall be satisfied that a faithful delineation of the Establishment is really intended. But we doubt whether the opinions suggested will be given unfettered expression, for as "la Rédaction" informs us, "elle se réserve le droit de commenter les opinions exprimées sous son égide et de dégager l'esprit dans lequel elle entend les proposer à son public." However much or little this restriction implies, it seems clear that only such a view of Anglicanism will be set forth as commends itself to the half-dozen clergymen who compose the "Bureau de la Rédaction."

However, we need not doubt the good faith of these zealous and learned men. They are convinced that there is a good case for the Church of England, and that, living its life, they are better fitted to explain it than those who view it from outside. That is a reasonable conviction and, as they hold it, they can only be commended for endeavouring to spread it abroad. They disclaim any wish to make converts to Anglicanism: all they want, so to speak, is that their Church shall not be misunderstood and condemned because it has not been heard on its own behalf.

Nevertheless, we must begin by clearly stating that, for reasons hinted at above, so far as they are addressing themselves to Catholics, they cannot possibly make good their claim to belong to the Church of Christ. Apart altogether from the historical assumptions on which their claim is based, they are in direct opposition to the immutable Catholic dogmas that the Church is one in doctrine, worship and discipline, that the Church is visible as well as indivisible, and that her membership is constituted, not merely by valid baptism, but also by communion with the central See of Rome. This is not a peculiar doctrine of Catholics in England: it is common to all members of the Church, and compels them to regard the ecclesiastical claims of other institutions, however much they may exhibit the outward appearances of the undivided Church, and however many of its doctrines they may profess, as wholly invalid. As institutions they have no part or share in the Church of Christ. Nothing written in *Æcumenica* can affect this fixed antecedent conviction of Catholics regarding the character of the organization which it sets out to explain and defend. Before Catholics could accept its claims, they would have to deny their faith and cease to be Catholics. There is only one Catholic doctrine about the Church, and that has been consistently held throughout the ages, from Our Lord's declarations in the Gospels to the Encyclical, "*Mortalium Animos*," whereby, in 1928, the present Holy Father expounded anew the conditions of Church membership. Those belong to the Church who, having been baptized, accept her teaching and submit to her authority.

All those who accept this idea of unity are within the visible unity of the one Church: those who reject that idea are outside the unity and can enter within it only by accepting the teaching and authority of the Church founded by Christ our Lord. Any other conception of

unity is tantamount to admitting that the promises of Christ have failed so far as His Church is concerned; and is a virtual denial of the divine origin of the Church.¹

This Encyclical was intended to put the true doctrine before minds which had been confused by the ill-advised "Malines Conversations," and it recalls the declaration of the Church's essential unity which formed part of the condemnation by the Holy Office of the ideas underlying the old "Association for Promoting the Union of Christendom"—the A.P.U.C.—which represented the first organized Anglican movement, by way of the "Branch Theory," towards Rome.

The Catholic Church is one by a unity conspicuous and perfect, embracing the whole earth and all nations, by that unity of which the principle, the root and the indefectible source is the supreme authority and more exalted principedom of St. Peter and his successors in the Roman See. And no other body is the Catholic Church, save and except that which is built upon one, namely, upon Peter, and rises up into one body compacted and fitly joined together in unity of faith and charity.²

Accordingly, it should be clear to "la Rédaction" that the Catholic must approach any projects for Christian unity which, through the grace of God, are so numerous today, in a way wholly dissimilar to that possible to other Christians. He cannot compromise his talent of faith; he must trade with it, indeed, and make it fructify, but he cannot try to change or diminish it. However much he longs for unity, he dare not purchase it by any display of that "largeur et souplesse" which *Œcumenica* (p. 3) claims that the English Church displays towards the "modernism" that is steadily permeating it. He must be on his guard lest any word or act or attitude of his should seem to contradict the essential truth of his position or obscure the Faith once delivered to the Saints, which it is his privilege to proclaim. Even Cardinal Wiseman, who was full of sympathy towards Anglicans, and had even seen, in the first flush of the Oxford Movement, a possibility of corporate union, later felt obliged to make the Roman authorities aware

that he had always been far from allowing the slightest

¹ "True Religious Unity," C.T.S. edition, p. 4.

² Quoted in Butler's "Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne," Vol. I, p. 347.

prerogative to the "Church" (as it professes to be) of England, whether in the matter of orders, of missions, of sacraments, or of instruction in doctrine: that, on the contrary, he had impugned all right, on the part of Anglicanism, to the name of church; and that he had warmly, and not ineffectually, invited each one singly to save his own soul by leaving a system of falsehood and error.¹

Sooner or later, those who wish to join the Catholic Church and come under the jurisdiction of Christ's Vicar, must face the fact that at present they are outside the Fold. To conceal this fact from them, as the assumptions of the A.P.U.C., and, later, the proceedings at Malines, tended to do, is always mistaken kindness, leading to the fostering of false hopes and making final acceptance more uncertain and difficult. This being so, our separated brethren should not take it amiss if, by stating the truth plainly, we should both prevent misunderstandings, and provide them with the most compelling motive for boarding the Ark of Salvation (in other words, the Bark of Peter), viz., the fact that there is no other. Nor should they say of us, as *Œcumenica* in this very issue (p. 77) says of THE MONTH, that we have "ni le don de sympathie, ni grand sens de perspective." On the contrary, it is our fixed footing on the Rock that enables us to appreciate the perilous case of those who are still adrift, and to show our compassion by telling them the only way to security. If they would but recognize that, according to the principles of our Faith, the sole means of re-uniting Christendom (the Church is not, nor can be, divided) is acceptance of the teaching of "Rome," they would not be so easily hurt at the expression of a definite belief sincerely held.

The widespread desire for Christian unity—a belated reaction from the reckless spiritual individualism of the Reformation, and itself due to a better understanding of the plain teaching of the New Testament—has latterly been quickened by the rise amongst more than one people of formally professed and organized atheism. Against this emergence of Antichrist, it surely behoves Christians to be united in action and profession, and consequently to search unceasingly for the principle of unity. That principle we Catholics claim already to possess—obedience to a living Authority, teaching and ruling in the name and with the commission of Christ.

¹ See Ward's "Life," Vol. II, p. 483.

It has operated successfully ever since the day of Pentecost in keeping the Church united. Wherever Catholics are found, they profess the same faith as authoritatively expounded to them, they use the same ineffably-sacred means of worship instituted by Christ, they partake of the same sacramental means of grace, they readily accept within the scope of his competence the spiritual ruling of Christ's Vicar. Although constantly, throughout the Church's history, individuals and whole communities have left her, her unity has been unimpaired, for it is the unity of a living organism, guaranteed indestructible by the abiding presence and influence of its Author. No other principle can be imagined, except individual guidance by the Holy Spirit, capable of uniting in the same beliefs countless multitudes of human minds of every variety of imperfection, and in the same obedience myriads of human wills liable to ignorance, pride and passion, than the conviction that the living Church and her Head speak on matters of faith and morals with the authority of God. Many other means of union have been tried; not one has succeeded. And the cause of Christianity against atheism and materialism would be weakened, not strengthened, if the Church, by federating with the sects, seemed to acknowledge that the truths it professed were provisional, uncertain, disputed; for that would be the case if union were attempted on any basis except acceptance of a living, infallible authority.

We must own, then, that, judged by Catholic principles, *Œcumenica*, for all its good intentions, presents a very inadequate view of the religion of Christ. Its very existence, as the organ of a "Church" which is not in communion with the centre and source of unity, is a denial of a fundamental fact. And its endeavour to justify a Christianity which "comprehends" contradictory doctrines, implies disbelief in the efficacy of Christ's purpose in founding His Church, and particularly in His promise that the Spirit of Truth should abide with her for all time. Its claim that the Church of England is "ferme et intransigeante sur le fondements de la foi" (p. 2) is negated by the preceding statement that "dans son sein elle unit les éléments catholiques, évangéliques et libéraux qui partout ailleurs s'opposent," for it is notorious that those "schools of thought" are not harmonious systems which combine to make a perfect whole, but are in violent opposition on such fundamental questions as the true God-head of Christ, the Fall of Man, the sacrificial character of

the ministry, the Real Presence, the divine institution of the Church, sacramental grace—and only combine to reject truths which we consider also fundamental, such as Papal Supremacy and Infallibility. The Review even claims that between Anglicanism and ourselves this unity exists, a bond which underlies all forms of Christianity. So, at least, we interpret the following—

Pendant plus de trois siècles Dieu a séparé l'Eglise d'Angleterre du grand corps romain, et l'a lentement façonnée, lui enseignant au prix de bien des larmes que, plus profonde que les systèmes catholiques et protestants, git une unité fondamentale (p.4).

And again, speaking of Anglicanism—

Son existence même pose le problème œcuménique et soulève la question d'un principe d'unité plus profond que les systèmes (p. 5).

Well, we all, Catholics and Protestants, doubtless believe in the existence of God, and Catholics share with a large number of other Christians the belief that Our Lord is the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, but, as a Church, we refuse to be classified as a system of Christianity, because we believe that we are the only true one. Between a Church founded on the principle of authority, divinely commissioned, living and infallible, and bodies which rest ultimately upon the individual conscience, there is no ecclesiastical common ground. The principle of "comprehensiveness" to which *Œcumenica* appeals, as a necessity of our benighted condition, is, in effect, a denial of revelation. To say—

cette largeur chrétienne, basée sur l'humble aveu que l'esprit humain ne saisit la vérité divine qu'imparfaitement, *per speculum et in ænigmate*, sait faire place à plus d'un point de vue, à plus d'une voie d'approche, à plus d'une façon d'adorer, et se glorifie d'une richesse si diverse—

might possibly be correct if the exercise of Christian broad-mindedness were confined to non-essentials, such as differences of outward rite, of language, of theological opinion beyond the range of dogma, but it is wholly inapplicable to revealed and defined doctrines. There is only one right "point of view" as to the meaning of the Mass, the effects of Baptism, the creation of the human soul, the inspiration of Scrip-

ture, the nature of Redemption : all others are wrong, and their ensemble creates, not riches, but confusion. Indeed, we see that, in spite of its claim to "largeness of mind," the English Church, feeling the reproach of not being able to distinguish between truth and falsehood, is always trying to find a measure of greater internal agreement. Conference after conference has been set up and failed. The Prayer Book discussion revealed why : there is no means within the body of deciding what is true, and no authority to command its acceptance. Our readers may recall, for we have frequently mentioned it, the fact that a Standing Committee was set up by the Anglican Archbishops in 1923, the business of which was "to consider the nature and grounds of Christian doctrine, with a view to demonstrating the extent of existing agreement within the Church of England, and with a view to investigating how far it is possible to remove or diminish existing differences." This Committee reports in general and optimistic terms every year, but has not yet been able to conclude its labours. But what can the Catholic argue from its very existence if not that the Church of England is anxious to limit as much as possible the comprehensiveness which, according to some, is its "glory," but which simply proclaims its inability to teach? And what conclusion can he draw from the Committee's terms of reference except that, though claiming to be part of the Church which Christ founded, Anglicanism does not yet know what precisely He taught?

In the light of this confessed inability to attain religious certainty, we can understand, even though we cannot respond to, the plea for Christian unity which *Œcumenica* puts forth. The times are menacing for the Christian cause, yet (it goes more pithily in English)—

How can it be that Christians ignore and disown each other? How can you, members of this or that Church or confession, gainsay or even repudiate multitudes of Christians because you believe them to be heretics or schismatics? Yet they have not chosen to be such. All they wanted was, quite simply, to follow Christ. Schism, if it is schism, is what they've been taught; heresy, if it is heresy, is what they've been taught. It is, doubtless, possible that there is something imperfect in their Christianity; but every Christian, *qua* human being, is imperfect (p. 6).

This eloquent reproach, which is meant, in the main, for Catholics, would be perfectly well deserved if Christ had not established a teaching Church to convey His revelation to all ages, and to mediate His graces to the souls of men. If all Our Lord had said to His followers on leaving them was—"The records of my life and teaching will presently be written; make what you can of them by exercising reason"—clearly men would be free to follow their judgments, and no one would have the right to dictate his creed to another. Heresy and schism would be meaningless words. But the fact that they are not meaningless shows that in the Christian tradition there have always been fixed standards of faith and discipline. In fact, nothing emerges more emphatically from Our Lord's various promises than His insistence that His disciples shall attain religious certainty. He Himself came to witness to the Truth, and He gave the same commission to His followers: "You shall know the Truth," He said, "and the Truth shall make you free." Again, "When He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will teach you all Truth." And in the full assurance that they knew what their Master had taught, the Apostles spoke and acted, expelling heretics and schismatics from the Fold, cautioning their hearers against some "that would pervert the Gospel of Christ," and speaking significantly of those who, despising authority, "are ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the Truth."

Thus it is that the Catholic, hating error with the same vehemence as he loves truth, cannot take up any attitude which seems to imply that heresy and schism are of secondary importance, even when those implicated in them are in good faith. Were he to act otherwise he would lessen their chances of release from their perilous state. To the sympathetic observer, one of the most distressing aspects of the Anglican system is its avowed tolerance of error, described by *Æcumenica* as "une méthode de largeur et de souplesse" (p. 3), which holds that "quelques imprudences de langage et même certaines audaces doctrinales dangereuses" (p. 4), may pass unrebuked in "périodes de transition comme la nôtre"—as if even in periods of transition (whatever they are) the witness of the Church might be temporarily silent. The whole tendency of the *mens haeretica* is to abolish mystery, to make vague what is definite, to minimize revelation, to rationalize—all in the interests of a spurious freedom unwilling to submit

to the obedience of faith. It is an inevitable tendency in religious systems where reason is the final arbiter of truth, and there is no living authority to guide and restrain. It is, therefore, somewhat disingenuous for "la Rédaction" to plume itself on the broadmindedness of the English Church, on the ground that it prefers to put up with "certaines audaces doctrinales dangereuses"—such as the Modernists' denial of the Fall of Man, of the Divinity of Christ, of His Virginal Birth and His bodily Resurrection!—"plutôt que d'imposer un silence arbitraire par des mesures de discipline extérieure et ainsi d'enchaîner la liberté de l'Esprit Saint." The writer knows well that his Church has no choice in the matter: it has no means of silencing heresy: it has no measures of external discipline to apply: it cannot define the truth and, therefore, cannot proscribe error; none of its members recognize that it can enjoin obedience under pain of sin. Its "tolerance" is essentially due to its inability to teach with authority, not to any vaunted breadth of mind. As for the implication in the last clause—that defined dogma fetters the liberty of the Holy Spirit—however innocently expressed, it is little short of blasphemous to the Catholic. Considering what Our Lord did and suffered in order to secure that His people should be "called out of darkness into His wondrous light," it is painful to think how, in defence of an impossible conception—a divided Church embracing contradictory doctrines—zealous men will still juggle with words in order to evade His plain and positive teaching.

It would serve no purpose to examine *Œcumenica* further. Its whole plea rests on a false assumption—that the Church of Christ is not One in doctrine, worship and discipline; not Visible as an organized Body with definite limits and conditions of membership; not Indefectible, preserving intact the whole of Christ's revelation, and teaching nothing else; not Indivisible, but rather consisting of autonomous or quasi-autonomous parts, giving no uniform witness to Truth. The structure which is raised upon such a foundation cannot but share its instability. The Catholic dogma of Unity is, indeed—*articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiæ*.

JOSEPH KEATING.

NOTE. On the cover of *Œcumenica*, addressed as it is to readers of French, is printed a quotation from de Maistre's "Du Pape," which French readers will have some difficulty in recognizing.

True, no source is given, and it is just possible that the words are taken from some other work of the great French publicist, but, more probably, it is an imperfect recollection of what de Maistre did write and, taken out of its context, as Father Gerard pointed out in these pages many years ago,¹ it misrepresents his meaning. What *Œcumenica* quotes is this: "Si jamais les chrétiens se rapprochent, comme tout les y invite, il semble que la motion doit partir de l'Eglise d'Angleterre." What de Maistre actually wrote runs as follows²: "Everything appears to indicate that the English people [not, notice, "l'Eglise d'Angleterre"] are destined to take the lead in the great religious movement which is preparing, and which will form a sacred epoch in the annals of mankind. In order to reach the light of truth before all others who have abjured it, they possess a twofold and inappreciable advantage, which they little suspect: it consists in this, that by the happiest contradiction imaginable, their religious system is at once the most evidently false and the most evidently near the truth."

De Maistre was a well-instructed Catholic and a staunch upholder of Unity under Papal Supremacy. No words can be fairly attributed to him which would make him out to be a forerunner of "Portalism."

¹ See THE MONTH, March, 1908, "De Maistre and Anglicanism," reprinted in "The Antidote," Vol. II, p. 59 (C.T.S.). See also, for de Maistre's real opinion, *The Tablet*, May 5, 1934, p. 560.

² "The Pope" (London, 1850), p. 349: a faithful translation of the French original which first appeared in 1817. The quotation appears in de Maistre's "Conclusion," p. 374 sq., of a French Edition of 1873.

By the Brook

FROM out the shadows of the wall
And fringed with coarse and tawny grass,
Darkling the rills of water pass
And o'er the downland fall.

Here strikes a ray of sunlight: lo!
Under the soft and silvery beam
That dances on the limpid stream
Agate and topaz glow.

Thus will I hope that God can dower
This common clay and sluggish blood,
To mirror His eternal good
And shrine His wondrous power.

CHARLES G. MORTIMER.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

A GLANCE AT THE ROYAL ACADEMY EXHIBITION: 1934.

ONE is extraordinarily conscious, in looking round the motley walls of the summer show at Burlington House this year, of living in two generations at once, for at every turn the work stigmatized by the enlightened of to-day as old-fashioned jostles elbows with what is definitely categorized as the modern school of painting. No one inspecting these walls with a careful and impartial eye could fail to give credit to the Hanging Committee of the Royal Academy for searching with much diligence among the works submitted to them—and apparently there were a record number this year—for the signs of talent that justified a place. There is meat for every man. "Gipsy Girl," by the late Mrs. Swynnerton, is a lovely picture, full of inward emotion and painter's craft; delicacy of feeling marks, also, the nevertheless virile portrait by Mr. Meredith Frampton of the Bishop of Exeter, while Mr. Glyn Philpot's pale and sensitive Vivian Forbes strikes a new and pleasing note in portraiture; it has courage and vision. Mr. Arnesby Brown again delights the eye with a wide landscape ("The Saltings"), Mr. Terrick Williams with his blue "Evening Hour, Honfleur." Mr. de Glehn shows some accomplished portraits, and several portrait studies by Mr. R. G. Eves are noticeable for their sympathetic treatment and quiet colour. Dame Laura Knight's brilliantly painted outdoor portrait group, and a charmingly seen figure study by Mrs. Dod Procter attract the eye, as does a puzzling allegorical composition by Mr. Mark Symons. And there is much good work besides.

So far, so good. Even the most catholic tastes, however, must find it difficult to sanction the presence of five, at all events, of the six exhibits by Mr. Stanley Spencer, hung, by virtue of his rank as an Associate of the Royal Academy, on the line. Can we admit, as a *Times* critic has suggested, that our disgust at this kind of artistic conception may simply be due to a limited vision, to reluctance to grant a place to anything new, while those who already assure Mr. Spencer of immortality have a saner judgment, a finer flair for new possibilities in art? They, forsooth, look to a time when the work of to-day may confidently be judged at long range, while the majority can only hark back to safe standards. A galling thought! But let us not be so easily intimidated. Let us glance back through the ages, past the (in their day, revolutionary) French Impressionists, the seventeenth century Dutch

masters, Velazquez, the Italian schools, even to the early Continental Primitives, with little or no useful tradition to guide them, and ask ourselves: why have they survived? Because they saw Nature, and Man in Nature, with humble but appreciative eyes, as lofty creations, through which they strove to express their awareness of beauty in the world and their reverence for higher things. Not only is such vision essential to the attainment of true art, but respect for Nature and humanity in the conception of any creative work is as vital as is a humble acknowledgment of human limitations.

Now Mr. Spencer has undoubted gifts. His work displays in a high degree technical merit, understanding of pattern and values, dramatic expression. The absence of charm in the way he lays on his paint or of any approach to reality, as we see it, in his figures or even his accessories, may be intentional, to force the observer's mind to the inner meaning of his works; or maybe the artist is so very intent on the meaning that truth to nature must be sacrificed. But what is his meaning? And, apart from this, even allowing Mr. Spencer his technical abilities, is this Art? If the appearance of the people depicted in most of his canvases may be trusted, they are only capable of human emotions of a strangely degraded type. This is most apparent in "Parents' Resurrection," and in "Villagers and Saints." In the latter, the attitude and expression of a sprawling male figure on the right emphasize this impression to the point of making the whole group appear debased. If Mr. Spencer did not definitely purport to deal with the spiritual side of life, and with such sacred subjects as resurrection and saints, his work might be left to the appreciation of those who can condone much for the sake of "cleverness." As it is, whether his intention is satirical or not, a protest must be uttered against encouraging any artist to trespass, with such results, on holy ground. Are these pictures really to be handed on to future generations as illustrations of our mentalities to-day? In the Middle Ages, when art was subject to ecclesiastical control, painting, architecture, and sculpture produced some of their most glorious and elevating masterpieces. Must we fall back upon mere public opinion, in these times, to exercise a control which study of long and great traditions in art should have rendered superfluous? In art, as in morals, and in every other department of man's spiritual activity, lightly to throw over the heritage of the past and thus to become *déraciné*, shows rather shallowness than originality.

J. JOSHUA.

P.S. Even a glance at the Exhibition cannot fail to notice what, in a very literal sense, is the most striking thing there—Sir Edwin Lutyens' mammoth model of Liverpool Catholic Cathedral, which, on grounds of religion as well as of art, deserves the most careful study.—Ed.

THE PARIS SODALITY.
1801—1830.

A PAPER in THE MONTH for March of this year, by Father A. Beck, A.A., gives an interesting account of the origins of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, and, incidentally, vindicates for Emmanuel Bailly a greater share in its foundation than is commonly assigned to him. That view finds further support in the previous religious activities of M. Bailly, undertaken in connexion with another organization, older than the S.V.P., and, like the latter, showing no signs of senile decrepitude. This was the Sodality of Our Lady in Paris, the history of which, from 1801 to 1830, will illustrate our point.

Revolutionary France was naturally the chief battle-ground for the conflict between "Liberalism" and the principle of Authority, human and divine, which shook the nations of Europe during the early nineteenth century, and time and again drenched the streets of Paris, Madrid, Vienna and other European capitals with blood. One aspect of this cult of pseudo-liberty is anti-clericalism, for your Liberal rightly regards the Church as the chief obstacle to that licence which he calls freedom, and has no scruple in identifying her with tyranny and reaction. Consequently, the French "Liberals" reserved their fiercest hatred for the members of the newly-restored Society of Jesus and their works. "The name Jesuit is on every tongue, but it is there to be cursed; it is repeated in every newspaper of the land with fear and alarm; it is carried throughout the whole of France on the wings of the terror that it inspires." So spoke the *Journal des Debats* in the twenties of the nineteenth century, when the opposition to the Society was at its height, and the spectacle of the great Father de Ravignan, himself a Sodalist, endeavouring to calm the mob which attacked the Jesuit house at St. Acheul in the June of 1830, was one to which Europe was rapidly becoming accustomed.

"Apparently a pious assembly of angels, a senate of sages, but in reality a circle of intriguing devils." So was the Sodality described by one in the opposite camp to the Liberals, the fanatic Monarchist, the Comte de Montlosier. The Sodalities he classed with the Jesuits, the Ultramontanes and the Clerical Encroachments as one of "the Four Calamities, which were going to subvert the throne." This view indicates how, not only Liberals but Monarchists and Traditionalists were disposed, for the furtherance of their several ends, to play upon the anti-clerical passions of the mob. The crowd which stoned de Ravignan at St. Acheul shouted indiscriminately for king, for emperor and for republic; but was entirely unanimous in its cry of "Death to the Jesuits: down with the priests."

The founder of the post-Restoration Paris Sodality was a cer-

tain Father Delpuits. When the Society of Jesus was dissolved in France in 1762, Delpuits was offered a canonry by de Beaumont, the Archbishop of Paris. He gave retreats to the clergy and laity and especially to the young university students of Paris, over whom his influence for good was most pronounced, so much so, that Lacordaire said of him, "Though others may have won more applause for their influence over young men, no one deserved it more than he." During the revolution Canon Delpuits was thrown into prison and subsequently exiled. Returning to France after the storm, he continued his good work amongst the young men of Paris, and on Candlemas Day, 1801, following the old Jesuit tradition, he called together six young students of the best families of the city, in a little room of No. 27, Rue Ste. Guillaume, for the purpose of re-founding the first of those French Sodalitys, the activities of which, in the cause of religion, set a high example for all similar associations elsewhere.

As is well known, a Sodality is an organization of Catholics, who unite together to lead, under the patronage of Our Lady, lives of active holiness. There is nothing, of course, exclusive in this profession, which is common to every religious association in the Church, but the intimate relationship which it establishes with the Virgin-Mother of God in His service, and the special cult of the virtue most prominently hers, give it a chivalrous inspiration of immense and unique value. With this ideal, strongly in contrast with the paganism of their surroundings, Father Delpuits, in 1801, managed to inflame the six young men, who formed the nucleus of the Paris Sodality. Their names are worth recording—Regis Buisson, the son of the Mayor of Louvesc, who, in 1798, had saved the relics of St. John Francis Regis from mob-destruction, the brothers Eugene and Matthew de Montmorency, and three others, Fiseau, Regnier and de Maignan. It was not long before they began to exercise a pronounced influence for good over their fellow-students at the university, polytechnic and technical schools. Genuine holiness showed its attractiveness for, by December 24, 1804, their numbers had risen to one hundred and ninety-three. On that same Christmas Eve, the Sodalists were presented, at St. Sulpice, to the Pope, Pius VII, who, by the terms of the recent Concordat, had come to Paris to crown Napoleon. The Holy Father was delighted with the Sodalists, and granted the Paris Sodality all the indulgences and privileges which had been accorded to so many of its predecessors in various parts of the world. In return, the Sodality was able to do the Pope a signal service (at the cost of its own official recognition) when, his patience at last overborne by the truculence of the "Corsican upstart," the Holy Father, in 1809, issued his Bull of Excommunication against Napoleon. This Bull had to be promulgated in France—no easy matter in face of the imperial police—but volun-

teers from the Sodality undertook the risky task. Franchet d'Esperey and Bertrand du Coin smuggled in the Bull as far as Lyons, whence the precious document was carried to Paris by Eugene de Montmorency, translated, and some few days later distributed and posted up throughout France. This exploit having been traced to its authors, Napoleon at once ordered the suppression and dissolution of the Sodalities throughout France, but though he could withdraw civil recognition, he could do no more. The work of the Sodality, even in Paris, went steadily on. Its members visited the sick in the hospitals, and the poor of the city learnt to know and bless these wonderful young men, whose visits brought such joy and hope into their hovels. They catechized the little children of the Paris slums, looked after orphans, nor did the prisoners in the gaols lie outside the range of their Christ-like charity. They brought aid to the struggling Catholic Press, whilst of particular interest is the help which they gave to the "Association de Saint Joseph," the first attempt in nineteenth-century France at a working-men's club, of the type that that great Sodalist and Social-Actionist, Albert de Mun, was later to make so common a feature of all its industrial centres. Moreover, two great works founded about this time, owed their origins wholly or in part to the efforts of the Paris Sodalists—the Societies of St. John Francis Regis and of St. Vincent de Paul. The former of these was founded in 1824 by Julius Gossin, a royal counsellor, who had become a Sodalist in 1819. Falling very ill, he made a pilgrimage, in 1824, to the tomb of the great Jesuit Apostle of the Villaret, where he vowed that, if he were cured, he would devote all his energies to stamping out the prevalent concubinage. His prayer was heard and, with the approval of the Archbishop of Paris, he set about his none too pleasant task, with a success that exceeded all expectations. Through the efforts of the Society which he founded, in Paris alone 62,907 irregular unions were set right, and 32,841 illegitimate children were duly acknowledged by their parents, during the years from 1826 to 1855.

As regards the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, which was founded in 1833, it would seem that the Sodality had anticipated its benevolent activities by several decades, and that the challenge addressed to Ozanam—"Where are the works to prove your faith"—was based on ignorance. Emmanuel Joseph Bailly de Surcy, another member of the Paris Sodality, was the Catholic publicist to whom Ozanam and his five companions instinctively turned, when they determined, in their own persons, to answer the sceptic's challenge. As Father Beck points out, the first meetings took place in the offices of Bailly's paper, the *Tribune Catholique*, and afterwards at his house. He became the first President, drew up its rules, and held office till he was succeeded, in 1844, by M. Gossin, the Sodalist mentioned above. It is certain that for seven

years previous to 1833, Bailly had directed some young men in the practice of works of charity, and that as early as April, 1820, he himself had entered the Paris Sodality, at the time when he was engaged in teaching Philosophy. The fact that a man of such Catholic zeal as Ozanam did not belong to the Sodality, although his elder brother Alphonsus was a very fervent member from the year 1824, is easily explained by the fact that it came to an end before he was old enough to join, but he must have heard of it from his elder brother, and especially of the "Society of Good Works," an association of Sodality members, organized by its Director the Abbé Legris-Duval, called by many "The Vincent de Paul of the Paris Slums," in 1812—1814. These Sodalists undertook precisely similar forms of charity to those later practised by the St. Vincent de Paul group, ranging from hospital visiting to catechizing young chimney-sweeps. However that may be, since the anti-Jesuit agitation, resulting in the closing of St. Acheul and other Jesuit colleges in France, just before the revolution of 1830 put a temporary stoppage to all Sodality activities, there was no other course open, in 1833, than to carry them on under the auspices of St. Vincent.

A glance at the names of Paris Sodalists during these three decades is not without its interest. They consist for the most part of medical men, students at the university, polytechnic and technical schools, soldiers and members of the aristocracy—all reacting vigorously to the official atheism of the period, and all proving their faith by good works. The ruling classes are represented by such names as those of Eugene and Matthew de Montmorency, Alexis de Noailles, Alexander de la Rochefoucauld, the Duke de Rohan-Chabot, and the Infante of Spain, François de Paul de Bourbon. Thirty-six future bishops, of whom three were Apostolic Nuncios and one, Mgr. Damoulin-Borie, a martyr, appear in the list. P. de Ravignan, S.J., the famous preacher, and the ex-Captain Magallon, who restored the Brothers of St. John of God in France, are amongst the members. The great names of Cauchy and Biot stand for science, and of Monmerqué for literature. Recamier, Maisonneuve the surgeon, Creuveilhier the famous anatomist and, greatest of all, Laënnec, the inventor of the stethoscope, the centenary of whose death was celebrated throughout France in 1926, were all members. Laënnec, in fact, was brought into the Sodality by another Sodalist, the celebrated physician Dr. Bayle. Much might be said of Laënnec, who, besides being one of the glories of the medical profession, was, like Pasteur in our own time, such a splendid Catholic. "Medicus pius, res miranda," said Pius VII, when he met him amongst the Sodalists at St. Sulpice, alluding, perhaps, to the old reproach—"ubi tres medici duo athei" which had some likely application in those revolutionary times.

Father Delpuits died in 1811 and had two successors in the next three years. Father Ronsin, S.J., held office until nearly the end, and during the fourteen years of his Directorship (1814—1828) he received nine hundred members. It was during the later years of this period that the calumnies against the Sodality, which was pictured as a sort of Jesuit "Ku-Klux-Klan," were at their height. A vigorous literary campaign was conducted against it not only by the anti-clerical underworld of those days, but even by such men as Thiers and the poet Béranger. De Montlosier was the most sensational of these fiction-mongers. The Sodality was pictured as a great sinister power, ruled by a clandestine government at whose head was a Jesuit, guiding and directing a vast secret army. Though in reality there were 1,373 members of the Paris Sodality, Montlosier assured his readers that the Sodalist "menace" was supported by an army of 48,000 men. Strange as it may seem to us, the tale was believed, and the anti-Sodalist propaganda found favour with thousands of Frenchmen in those dark days of 1827, when Lamennais described the French people as being under the influence of a *frayeur générale*. The fury of the "sectaires," and the calumnies heaped on the Society and the Sodality during the period of the "Ordonnances," caused the ecclesiastical authorities of Paris to ask Father Ronsin, for the sake of peace, to leave Paris. This he did in 1828. The Sodality maintained a precarious existence for some two years longer under the guidance of the Duke de Rohan, the Abbé Matthew (the future Archbishop of Besançon) and the Abbé Bordérie (later Bishop of Versailles). The death blow came at the end of that time, for the Sodality was suppressed in 1830, when the last of the anti-Jesuit Bourbons, Charles the Tenth, was driven from his kingdom to seek refuge at the country seat of an old Jesuit pupil and an actual member of the Paris Sodality—Sir Thomas Weld of Lulworth.

PAUL R. CRANE.

EDITORIAL NOTE

To secure their return if not accepted, contributions submitted to the Editor must be accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope. Articles so submitted should be concerned with matters of general interest, and be the fruit of expert knowledge or original research; nor should they ordinarily exceed 3,200 words (between 8 and 9 pages). As a general rule, subjects dealing with the exposition of theology and ethics are reserved for the staff.

II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES

- BLACKFRIARS:** May, 1934. **Father Bede Jarrett, O.P.**, by Bernard Delany, O.P. [An illuminating appreciation of the character and personality of the famous Dominican.]
- CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW:** April, 1934. **The Concordat with the Third Reich**, by J. B. Mason. [An examination of the successive violations of the Agreement by the Nazis.]
- CATHOLIC MEDICAL GUARDIAN:** April, 1934. **The Popes and Anatomy**, by James J. Walsh, M.D. [A modern refutation of the old slander that Boniface VIII forbade dissection.]
- CATHOLIC TIMES:** April 27, May 4, 11, 18, 25, 1934. **Catholicism and the Totalitarian State**, by Christopher Dawson. [A series of articles showing how Fascism differs from other State systems and how far it is reconcilable with Catholicism.]
- CITÉ CHRÉTIENNE:** April 20, 1934. **La Paix dans les Balkans**, by H. Nicaise. [A summary of recent acts and projects for Balkan Federation, and of the obstacles in the way.]
- CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA:** May 19, 1934. **La Concezione dello Stato nel Terzo Reich**, by A. Messineo, S.J. [The nature of Nazism, deduced from Herr Hitler's writings and rejected as ethically wrong.]
- CLERGY REVIEW:** May, 1934. **The Ethics of Contraception**, by Victor White, O.P. [An admirable exposure on natural grounds of the intrinsic viciousness of the practice.]
- DUBLIN REVIEW:** April, 1934. **Evolution and the Concept of Species**, by Dr. W. R. Thompson. [Shows how no theory of Evolution can make Transformism intelligible.]
- ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:** May, 1934. **The Priest and the Motion-Picture Problem**, by P. H. Furfey, Ph.D. [A disclosure of the obstacles to reform the Films, sc. "Blind booking" and "Block selling."]
- FAR EAST:** Mar., 1934. **The Plight of the Philippines**, by Rev. E. J. McCarthy. [A sad picture of the decay of a Catholic people, owing to the expulsion of the Spanish clergy and the substitution of American secular education.]
- IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD:** Feb., Apr., May, 1934. **The Spirit of Soviet Education**, by Professor J. M. O'Sullivan. [Examines in much detail the means by which the Soviets are trying to create a new educational philosophy.]
- MODERN SCHOOLMAN:** May, 1934. **Holding-Companies; are they Ethical?** [An Examination by an ethical expert into the morality of Holding-Companies, and a decision that, as operated, they sin against justice.]
- UNIVERSE:** May 11, 1934. **The British Union of Fascists.** [Editorial warning against Catholic adherence without further examination of its moral views.]

REVIEWS

I—RELIGION v. THE WORLD¹

THIS book is too important for a short review to spend space over detailed criticism—this would be easy: a sentence like "Science has established the rational truth of certain positions about the age of the universe, the beginnings of life, and the descent of man . . . orthodoxy has managed to accept them, without any enduring sense of loss, despite the fact that it involved a revision of the current conceptions both of Inspiration and of Miracle" (pp. 159, 160), holds us up: we do not admit the first half; and the Catholic would make several distinctions before he admitted the second. We recall, however, that these nine writers are not all Catholics, nor is the editor, who also writes the foreword, so they do not all define "orthodoxy" in quite the same way, and are not exhibiting quite the same thing—we say "exhibiting," not "defending," for this book is an attack rather than mere defence. Its chapters deal with Orthodoxy *vis-à-vis* the New Religions, the New Morality, Economics, Sociology, Psychology, Music, History, the Novel, and the Universe scientifically considered. Naturally, the substitution of impressionism—"feeling"—for reason (which is, I should think, now past its apogee), is insisted on in most of the chapters: that on music marks a curious exception. Music used always to be held to be an expression of emotion, however intellectual might be the shape taken by the "composition." Many would regard Bach as emotional as Beethoven. But now, Mr. Martin Shaw declares, music has no more to be "inspirational": it must be purely scientific in its selection and arrangements of sounds. Well, the old music had plenty of "rules," emotional as it was: and there is plenty of musical emotionalism to-day, even in "new" musics. My belief might be, that a few modern composers scorn emotions and have none; and that many others have only second-rate ones. They have not those which correspond to faith, hope and charity. This "insensitiveness," as St. Paul long ago said, is the ultimate result of paganism. You either become numb, "hard-boiled" (as girls, now middle-aged, used to like to say they were), or melt into a morass of sensations and ask but for nerve-thrills. This is, explicitly, why Mr. Ellis Roberts finds the modern novel (it, too, swiftly altering into a better thing) to be essentially "depressing." Man is represented as not only victim, but part, of im-

¹ *Orthodoxy Sees it Through*. A Symposium. Edited by Sidney Dark. London: Barker. Pp. 274. Price, 8s. 6d.

personal forces. Yet Tolstoi, Walter de la Mare, indeed, Aldous Huxley and D. H. Lawrence, not to mention a host of Continental writers, are *aspiring*, sometimes desperately, and almost ludicrously, towards a supernatural X, for the lack of which all life has played the "naturalists" false. Mr. Lunn, writing (if I may say so) less crashingly (not less cogently), more seriously (not less amusingly—in fact, more so), than is his wont, tackles the sort of thing that is put forth by Mr. G. Heard (for whom one cannot have any esteem), Mr. H. G. Wells (who, we might have supposed, was quite old-fashioned; however, university students still appear to read him), and Mr. Julian Huxley (who always shocks us when he ventures into any philosophical field). But Mr. Lunn deals perfectly well with the "Science says" and the "May we not feel" schools; and stresses the degradation into which religious modernism has so rapidly sunk. Perhaps Fr. M. C. D'Arcy has never written any briefer thing that is better than his chapter on Morality. This may be the best "nourished," as well as most irresistibly-stated, chapter in the book. It might be wise to skip the chapters on Economics, Sociology and the "Universe" till that on Psychology has been read, though it is that with which we are least in agreement, so far as this or that sentence may go. I should then read that on History, by Mr. Douglas Jerrold, though I think he has not attended to the quite new element in historical writing which Mr. Harold Nicolson (it appears) so much dislikes—the discovery of an "end" in human events, even, a "providence," and by no means the mere interplay of mechanistic and pre-determined forces (though, of course—how were they "determined" anyway?). Perhaps the chapter on the "Universe" reflects the pessimism, or at least scepticism, about itself towards which physical science itself is turning, though it never need do so if only it would refrain from philosophizing. If it seems odd that anyone permits himself to write about religion (as Mr. Heard does) without any knowledge at all of its subject-matter, so does it seem strange that men, admirably trained in physical science, but not at all in philosophy, *will* philosophize! The remaining chapters are almost terribly important because they directly concern human life, and we have to "do something about it," and at once. They provide a sharper goad than some of the others do—for instance, we really can leave music to look after itself.

Roughly, then, this book is on the side of belief in God, in an immortal soul, and in a divine purpose and end for human affairs. It is not shy about this, and, in fact, it has an almost easy task in showing that what was so "terrifying" seventy or fifty or even twenty-five years ago has inflicted no injury at all on the intellectual bases of these beliefs, but, on the contrary, has, by cutting its own and so many other people's throats, displayed how necessary they are. We expect secularism in the days to come to de-

liver its last infuriated kicks. We do not think that Christians are in for an easier time of it in the concrete. But we can trust that the Church, not atheist Communism, will be able to rebuild her altars on the ruins which the last hundred years (to look no further back) have so plentifully provided.

C.C.M.

2—HOW TO USE KNOWLEDGE¹

AS is well known, the custom of making speeches at private banquets and social reunions is far more general and frequent in the United States than in this country. It is natural, therefore, where felicity and facility of utterance is so prized, to find that the effort to cultivate it should bulk largely in educational programmes, that elocution-classes should be prominent in high schools, and that competitions between teams selected to represent university debating-clubs should be events of common occurrence. Accordingly, wise educators there are concerned to devise a curriculum of literary and oratorical exercises which may most effectively foster a mastery of lucid, attractive, and cogent exposition.

In the work before us Father Donnelly, Professor of Rhetoric in Fordham University, and author of several books on different aspects of the subject, advances a plea for a course of literary and rhetorical instruction, based on the Jesuit "*Ratio Studiorum*," which he regards as still of universal application, and not to be dismissed as a matter of merely antiquarian interest. It is with the authority of over forty years' experience, involving an intimate acquaintance with every stage in the secondary school, and not merely as a theorist, that Father Donnelly writes. His previous works have had considerable vogue and one, "*Model English*," has been for many years in continuous use in several hundred schools. The work under review is more restricted in its scope than its title would imply, since it does not profess to expound theory except incidentally, or to deal either with the disciplinary or religious prescriptions of the "*Ratio*" or with its application to university studies. Such topics have been adequately discussed by other Jesuit writers, as, for instance, by T. Hughes in "*Loyola*" (in the *Great Educators* series), R. Schwickerath in "*Jesuit Education*," W. J. McGucken in "*The Jesuits and Education*," J.-B. Herman in "*La Pédagogie des Jésuites au XVI^e Siècle*," and by Dr. E. A. Fitzpatrick in "*St. Ignatius and the Ratio Studiorum*."

The merit of Father Donnelly's book lies in its practical application of the "*Ratio*" methods to the literary exercises of the

¹ *Principles of Jesuit Education in Practice*. By Francis P. Donnelly, S.J. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. Pp. 205. Price, \$2.00.

secondary school. It gives a valuable précis of the Report, so far issued in two of its five parts in 1923 and 1924 by the American Classical League, Princeton, N.J., which embodies the findings of a scientific investigation into the present status of Latin in the U.S.A., England, France and Germany. This Report sets forth a systematic classification of the objectives to be aimed at in Classical education and of the means by which they may best be attained, and incidentally reveals the fact that there are at present over a million students of Latin in the States. After the briefest historical survey the author passes to the discussion of purely practical questions. He contrasts the permanent and universal value of a systematic literary training at this stage in Latin and English with the uncertain, and often admittedly disappointing, results of "vocational" syllabuses and eclectic experiments introduced in recent decades into many American high schools. He deplores the subordination, not to say the sacrifice, of true literary culture, involving proficiency in composition and version and the cultivation of aesthetic appreciation and criticism, to the laborious accumulation of a cumbrous outfit of collateral erudition in such subjects as philology, archæology, and mythology—a process which tends to bore and bewilder the student and beget in him a distaste for the Classics as literature. He aptly quotes Dr. Rouse's dictum—probably more applicable to the universities in Germany than to the gymnasia—"The current method is no older than the nineteenth century. It is the offspring of German scholarship which seeks to learn everything about something rather than the thing itself."

The book contains much that is suggestive to teachers of literature, much, in fact, to recommend it as a special subject for the pedagogy examination of a Training College. It shows how a literary course conducted on the lines of the "Ratio" tends to stimulate important habits of mind, observation, orderliness, and that attention to accuracy which has been described as a "scholarly conscience." It further maintains the thesis that imitation of the best models, if judiciously pursued, is quite reconcilable with originality. There are chapters for the teacher and the taught. Emphasis is laid on the value and importance of the "Prelection" as a means of imparting the rules of analysis and synthesis and the artifices of style. Directions are given for the recording of oral work, the correlation of Latin and English, and the choice of authors to be read, with particular reference to their being graded in difficulty and varied in such a way as to sustain the student's interest. The author's experience leads him to prefer the form to the block system, so far, at least, as linguistic instruction is concerned, and that not merely on the general ground that it strengthens the position of the master as an ethical influence, but also because it enables him better to secure co-ordination be-

tween the different literary subjects. As for the student, he is to be encouraged, and his spirit of emulation fostered. He should be produced in public as much as possible that he may realize himself, and give a specimen of his quality, to which end he should, in addition to his ordinary activities, co-operate with his fellows in the team work of academies. There is something radically defective in an education which equips a student with knowledge, but turns him out inarticulate. He is poor in the midst of plenty.

H.I.

3—THE HOLY SHROUD¹

IN a volume which, from its excellent photographic reproductions and clear, bold type, is very attractive to the eye, Mgr. Barnes has brought together the various notices which, for some years past, he has devoted to the "Holy Shroud" of Turin in the *Dublin Review*, the *Universe* and other periodicals. Our readers will know that on more than one occasion an opinion has been expressed in *THE MONTH* unfavourable to the genuineness of this alleged relic. We must confess that neither the re-statement of the case in the book before us, nor the report furnished of the results of the fuller investigation of 1931, have led us to modify our previous judgment. Though Mgr. Barnes declares that "everyone in the cathedral who saw the relic thus exposed to view realized at once that all the theories put forward by Canon Chevalier . . . had completely and irrevocably broken down," a good many doubters seem to be still unrepentant. For example, towards the close of 1932, there was published in Germany by the eminently orthodox firm of Herder of Freiburg, the fourth volume of the "Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche." This work, which has for its editor-in-chief Mgr. Buchberger, Bishop of Regensburg, takes the place of the now out-of-date "Kirchenlexikon," and is recognized as of the highest authority in point of scholarship. But the article "Grabtuch Christi," though making reference to the exposition of 1931, supports the adverse conclusions of Canon Chevalier, and assures us that the numerous answers which have been attempted have not in any way shaken the force of his demonstration.

The point specially stressed by Mgr. Barnes is that the recent microscopic examination of the shroud has revealed no trace of a pigment or of any outline, from which he argues that Chevalier's contention that it was a painting of the middle of the fourteenth century must be unfounded. Even if a pigment, however, had been employed, it is by no means clear that after it had scaled off

¹ *The Holy Shroud of Turin*. With plates. By Mgr. A. S. Barnes. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne. Pp. 70. Price, 7s. 6d.

as the result of the incessant folding and unfolding, or of the conflagration at Chambéry, or other causes, the paint might not have left behind it a discolouration of the linen, which is what we see to-day. If the Sacred Blood, as Mgr. Barnes suggests, trickled on to the shroud, the Blood is now no longer there, but it has left a stain behind. In any case, when writing in these pages thirty years ago, we made no suggestion that the cloth had been painted with pigments. There were certainly ways of tracing patterns on linen, probably with vegetable tinctures, though nothing is known of the process employed. It is part of Mgr. Barnes's case that a copy of the shroud was made to be given to Besançon in place of the original which had been stolen from the cathedral. How was that copy executed? Chifflet seems to have been unconscious that there was any substantial difference in the artistic character of the two shrouds. He does not suggest that any paint was flaking off from the linen at Besançon. On the other hand, he does tell us that the form of the body at Besançon showed out in pale yellow, while only the five wounds were marked in red. Similarly, Archbishop Paleotto went to the expense of printing a so-called facsimile of the Turin shroud in two colours, red and yellow. All this seems to be fatal to the monochrome theory of Vignon and Mgr. Barnes.

Mgr. Barnes holds that the impression on the linen was made immediately after the body of Our Lord was taken down from the Cross. Of course, if this was a miracle, no one can say him nay, but throughout the book, M. Vignon's vaporograph theory seems to be taken as a demonstrated conclusion of science. If so, it is difficult to understand how the impression, which surely cannot have been an instantaneous one, was not blurred when the body was removed to the sepulchre, and the shroud, as he assumes, tightly bound round it with bandages. The vaporographic activity could not come to an end in a few minutes. But the difficulties, it seems to us, are endless, not the least being the complete silence of the Evangelists and particularly of St. John, concerning this stupendous picture which, even if a negative, filled the observer of more than a thousand years later with astonishment because the blood was as crimson as if it had only been shed that day. Mgr. Barnes, who is fertile in deductions from slender premises, finds in the shroud evidence that Our Saviour's feet were pierced with one nail, that there was a foot-rest, that this was slanting, and that a trickle of blood had run from the feet after the body was laid on the shroud. It is curious that he should also state three times (pp. 2, 37, 38) that "the feet of both figures" (*i.e.*, front and back), were concealed when the shroud was exhibited in 1898. A moment's inspection of the plates in the books of M. Vignon or M. Loth will show that the feet in the posterior image are quite fully shown, though this was not the case with the front

impression; for the linen, in 1898, was not accurately centred in its frame. Much more of it was turned under on the left hand than on the right. The fact is, that the later inspections have added nothing to our information.

H.T.

4—A CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHER¹

OFTEN when reading the lively editorials of the *Catholic World*, written by one who brings to all he surveys the standard of Catholic truth and the test of eternal values, one has lamented that they should be doomed to pass away into the files, to be occasionally resuscitated by an effort of memory or from scattered and inadequate notes. We are, accordingly, rejoiced that friends have persuaded Father Gillis to allow a selection of his editorials during the past decade to appear in book-form. For, though only "occasional" in their provenance, these comments of a well-stored mind and a ripe judgment are of substantial worth, providing solid intellectual food of a highly nutritious character. They are mainly constructive, showing how, in the Catholic Faith and the Church's philosophy, the ever-recurring problems which perplex the faithless and uninstructed find their solution. The latter, so numerous in that vast country where, it is said, two-thirds of the inhabitants are without religious affiliations, have afforded Father Gillis superabundant material for the exercise of his critical gifts, and his calm gaze has surveyed, month by month, the prolific field of American heathendom, fixing itself mainly upon those hordes of philosophers, scientists, university professors, economists, novelists and politicians, whom the absence of moral standards and a knowledge of the object of life, by no means deter from posing as guides to the multitude. At times, too, he makes a book, or a political event, or an economic theory, or a popular practice, the theme of his illuminating essays. A mere glance at the seven-paged Index shows the amazing width of his interests, and sends one eagerly back to the contents, with the certainty of finding there both enlightenment and charm. For the Editor possesses a singularly effective style, which is always irradiated by an underglow of humour (see the delightful but merciless excoriating of a "behaviourist" Professor, in the paper entitled "Ain't Psychology Grand"!) and pregnant with historical and literary allusion. He does not—and we are grateful to him—confine his strictures to the anti-Catholic abnormalities of his own land. Our Dean Inge, our Mr. Wells, our Bertrand Russell, are all dealt with faithfully—the first-named for his unworthy

¹ *This Our Day: Approvals and Disapprovals.* By James M. Gillis, Editor of the *Catholic World*. New York: The Paulist Press. Pp. xiii, 405. Price, \$4.00

attack upon Newman's memory—and shown to the American public just as we see them here. Father Gillis, in his earlier book "False Prophets," has manifested with what skill he could dissect the pretensions of illogical thinkers, sharing in this the capacity of the late Harvey Wickham; within the narrower limits of these essays the same power is displayed in a concentrated form which is all the more deadly. But, as we said, the essayist builds more than he destroys, and gives us throughout an admirable *exposé* of Catholic principles in art and literature, science and philosophy, politics and economics. In the last-mentioned field, the gigantic experiment now being tried by Mr. Roosevelt makes his treatment the more vivid, and should help to rally Catholic Americans in support of their President against the forces of Mammon. We lay aside this important and most entertaining book with reluctance, tempered by the reflection that there is much more of the same excellent sort where it came from, and that the supply is constantly growing.

J.K.

5—SOME CATHOLIC BIOGRAPHIES¹

WE have grouped together here men of the Catholic Faith, living in different ages and regions and circumstances; all clerics except two, but otherwise as diverse in character, outlook, and attainments as could well be imagined; united, nevertheless, by the most fundamental and enduring bond of all—a knowledge that they were children of God and bound to serve Him, and a lifelong purpose to fulfil their end. *Place aux Saints!* Some were heroic in their service, and to these belonged Blessed Thomas More, for all that he tried to make his saintly life and gallant death seem commonplace. Mr. Sargent brings freshness of insight and distinction of style to the well-known story of that inspiring career. He is by no means a mere chronicler, but one soaked in the times and literature of his subject, who can marshal events and collate examples so as to illustrate the many aspects of his character, maintaining the while a wise and witty commentary on the thought and ideals of the age. Not only the great Chancellor and sincere Christian lives in these pages, but many of those others, who, by contrast or mere intercourse, served to emphasize his high principles—the easy-going King gradually

¹ (1) *Thomas More*. By Daniel Sargent. London: Sheed & Ward. Pp. 300. Price, 7s. 6d. n. (2) *St. Benedict*. By Abbot Cabrol, O.S.B. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne. Pp. ix, 155. Price, 5s. (3) *Don Bosco*. By Johannes Jörgensen. Same Publishers. Pp. xvi, 272. Price, 5s. (4) *The Life of Cardinal Mercier*. By John A. Gade. London: Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. ix, 312. Price, 10s. 6d. n. (5) *The Life of Cardinal Vaughan*. Abridged. By J. G. Snead-Cox. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne. Pp. vii, 373. Price, 5s. (6) *The Life and Lyrics of Richard Rolle*. By Frances Comper. London: Dent & Sons. Pp. xx, 340. Price, 7s. 6d. n. (7) *Father Arnold Janssen*. By F. M. Lynk, S.V.D. London: Alexander Ouseley. Pp. 239. Price, 3s. 6d.

growing blind to all things holy through his lusts, the great Wolsey serving himself rather than God or his King, the peevish Erasmus, inflated with his knowledge, the saintly Fisher and the crafty Cromwell, and, above all, the members of More's own family—all these are vividly depicted in this delightful biography. It will serve under Providence to teach his own countrymen the treasure they still possess in Blessed Thomas More—*hominem Anglorum omnium optimum*, in Pole's emphatic tribute.

Abbot Cabrol's little masterpiece of biography, the French original of which we reviewed in February, has not had to wait long for a translator. Anyone who wishes to know in comparatively short compass how the monastic system developed in Europe, after the earlier experiments in asceticism in the Egyptian deserts, cannot do better than read *Saint Benedict*, ably translated by Miss C. M. Antony. It is a popular "life" in the best sense, exhaustive but not losing itself in details, and accurate, making use of the latest researches. Even the scholar may read it with profit, for in notes and bibliography, the author has provided ample material for further study. It was St. Benedict who gave an immense impetus to the recitation of the Divine Office in the West, and all lovers of the liturgy, a growing band, will find here how he established and fostered the *opus Dei*, the main occupation of the monk, a "work" which so scandalizes a materialistic, utilitarian and earth-bound age, just because of its ignorance of God.

Someone has compared the half-smile which appears in the ordinary portrait of Don Bosco to that worn by Monna Lisa, but there is nothing secret or enigmatic about the former. It glows with kindness and love, a faithful reflex of the heart of its owner, who was a standing proof of the power of divine charity, exercised towards God's children, to raise an ordinary life to the heights of perfection. The details of that career are at the moment familiar to all, as the recent canonization proceedings have proclaimed it to the Catholic world. However, as told by the distinguished Danish litterateur, Johannes Jørgensen, in *Don Bosco*, that marvellous story takes on new beauties. In the eyes of the world it was commonplace, but how filled with supernatural wonders to those brought into contact with its subject! And what a complete answer it provides to the scoffer who asks—"What good Christianity has done," or to the sceptic who asserts, "The age of miracles has passed"! Here are the latter in shoals, well-authenticated by witnesses of our own generation, and, as for the work done by this one man, a chapter at the end of the book, appropriately headed, "The Mustard Seed," shows by statistics what a mighty tree, overshadowing not only Italy, but other far-distant regions, the Institute of the Saint has become. This is a most encouraging and edifying book.

The Life of Cardinal Mercier is written by an American

Protestant, who calls himself a "Citoyen du Hainaut," and has secured for his biography a Catholic *Imprimatur*, a unique tribute, surely, to its objectivity of treatment. To Mr. John A. Gade, the author, it has been a labour of love: he has felt that an "outsider," provided he brought diligence and sympathy, might add some traits to a picture already so carefully elaborated by men of the Cardinal's own nation and Faith, and he was anxious to attempt the task whilst many of the great man's intimates were still alive and accessible. Judging by the names of those whom he thanks in his preface, the author has spared no pains to get at the truth, and the result is, as he has desired it to be, a fine delineation of Belgium's heroic Churchman, never wholly to be superseded by anything to be written later. He naturally begins with the Cardinal's family and finds, fittingly enough, much of his subject's nobility of character and high ideality to be due to his saintly mother. Then, step by step, he traces his intellectual career. His clerical vocation developed early, and he passed with distinction through the various seminaries until, in due course, he was ordained priest, and then in obvious recognition of his talents himself became a professor at the early age of twenty-six. No one attempting to write such a life should be ignorant of that *philosophia perennis*, the teaching and exposition of which occupied almost the whole of it. Mr. Gade shows himself fairly competent, and is able to indicate the effect upon the ecclesiastical training of the Church of Pope Leo's famous Encyclical "*Æterni Patris*," published in 1879. Mercier, after an interview with the Pope, was appointed to profess Thomistic Philosophy at Louvain, and inaugurate there that neo-Scholasticism which Leo felt to be the Church's best defence against modern errors. Only those who know Louvain as it then was, and as it now is, can conceive what a world of anxious labour the young professor had to put forth in carrying out the Pope's ideal. That we need not dwell on, nor on the gradual advance he made, in influence and reputation, until, in 1906, he was raised to the high office of Archbishop of Malines. With the date of the War and the invasion of Belgium, his name passes into history. No one man did more to keep up the morale not only of his own country, but of all the Allies, than this great prelate whom nothing could silence, and whose pen proved mightier than the sword of the invader: an omen, indeed, which Nazi Germany to-day would do well to observe. After the War, came the reconstruction of his shattered country and the gradual breaking up of his own iron constitution. His death, in 1926, closed seventy-seven years of incessant activity for God and his neighbour. The judgments of Mr. Gade, forced, necessarily, to rely upon hearsay, and viewing ecclesiastical politics from the outside, cannot always be accepted. He tells one story of the youthful Père Mercier and the artist Meunier (p. 48), which is frankly

incredible. And some of the gossip he repeats about jealousies and what-not amongst highly-placed Churchmen is probably due to ill-natured gossip. But the work, as a whole, deserves its "Nihil obstat."

We pass to another great Churchman in the *Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, abridged from the two-volume biography of Mr. Snead-Cox which, appearing first in 1910, and going through two reissues, has long been out of print. It was a happy thought to reduce it in bulk by omitting much of its documentation, and thus introduce it to a much wider public. For the life of the Cardinal who founded and built the Westminster Cathedral was an intensely spiritual and edifying one, especially as showing the possibility of being a thorough Englishman and loyal son of the Church of Rome.

We published an extensive review of the first edition of Miss Frances Comper's *Life of Richard Rolle* in March, 1930: this new issue is identical with the former, even to the insertion of a slip disclaiming, on account of illness, any acquaintance with Miss Hope Allen's almost contemporary discussion of "Writings ascribed to Richard Rolle." Accordingly, Miss Comper's excellent treatise still lacks the finality which it might have gained from that learned work, as also from an article by a French Benedictine on the details of Rolle's life, which appeared in our own pages in January, 1926. It remains, however, one of the best accounts of the Yorkshire mystic that we have in English.

The recent establishment of a missionary society of priests at Hadzor, near Droitwich, has called attention to a very flourishing organization and made an account of it and its founder a real *desideratum*. This is provided in *Father Arnold Janssen, S.V.D.*, translated by the Rev. F. M. Lynk of the same Congregation, and abridged from the larger German work by Father Fischer. The founder, a German priest who, on account of the Kulturkampf, had to start his Institute at Steyl in Holland, lived for only three-score years, yet such was his energy and zeal, that in the thirty-four years in which he guided its destinies it has spread over both the Old and the New Worlds, and to-day rivals St. John Bosco's Salesians in the extent and fecundity of its labours. When we recall the fact that Dr. Schmidt, the world-renowned anthropologist is a member of the Society of the Divine Word, we realize what services such missionaries do to science as well as to religion.

SHORT NOTICES

THEOLOGICAL.

BY the publication in three volumes of their translation of St. Thomas's *De Potentia—On the Power of God* (B.O. & W.: each volume 7s. 6d.)—the Dominican Fathers have made accessible to English readers one of the most important of the great Doctor's minor treatises, selected from the class disputations whereby he used to drive home the substance of his lectures. They are intensely interesting to students of the *Summa* as, dealing often with the same subjects, they throw more light upon St. Thomas's mind and meaning, and illustrate the thoroughness with which he faced and solved the innumerable difficulties which arise from the study of ultimates. The thanks of Catholic students are due to the promoters of this great enterprise, now in its twenty-third year, completing thirty-four volumes, and particularly to Father Laurence Shapcote, O.P., who, it is revealed, has so successfully performed the colossal task of translating them all.

MORAL.

In the inspiring address to his pupils, **Honour: a Talk to Boys** (Vaughan School: 6d.), Canon J. G. Vance, Headmaster of the Vaughan School, treats a well-worn subject with wonderful freshness, for, instead of leaving the notion impressive yet vague, he defines its nature by its effects. The honourable man will keep his word, will not seek self unduly, will take no unfair advantage. Consequently, he will not make rash promises, will show due consideration for others, and will be content to lose if he cannot justly gain. Touching the question of morality, Dr. Vance finally shows that, although it is possible to be dishonourable without sin, the proper practice of honour demands ultimate reference to God as giver of life and grace; due self-respect, on which the sentiment of honour is based, is impossible in a conscious sinner, though he may well affect, like Lancelot in the Idyll, a spurious integrity.

BIBLICAL.

Father Tonna-Barthet has brought out the second volume of his work on the Gospels (**Les Evangiles: Tome II: Saint Luc—Saint Jean**. Maison de la Bonne Presse: 15 fr.). He prints the text in paragraphs, adding on the average (to give a rough impression) about the same amount of simple commentary between the paragraphs. How simple it is may be guessed, for example, from the fact that he prints and explains the story of the woman taken in adultery (John viii, 1—11) without any hint of a textual difficulty. He apparently imagines that (apart from Luke xvi, 18) there are no parallel passages in the other Gospels to Luke ix, 51—xviii, 14

(p. xi); and that St. John passes over in silence the year of ministry recounted in the Synoptic Gospels (p. 193). We cannot but think that even such a simple commentary as this should be founded upon a more serious study of the Gospels.

APOLOGETIC.

More than ever to-day are Catholic economists under the ægis of the Papacy engaged in exposing the essential inhumanity of "Manchester-school" individualism which, by ignoring God's law, only succeeded in systematizing the oppression of mankind. It was all the more wanton, therefore, on the part of Dr. H. M. Robertson, in his *Aspects of the Rise of Economic Individualism*, to choose this period for making an attempt to fix upon the Jesuits the reproach of having done much, by their moral teaching, to foster the growth of the *laissez-faire* economics, and he cannot complain if, in *The Economic Morals of the Jesuits: an Answer to Dr. H. M. Robertson* (Oxford University Press: 5s. n.), Father J. Brodrick, S.J., counters with a spirited refutation of the Professor's charges which, for all its courtesy and restraint, must seriously damage the attacker's reputation as a competent historian. The truth appears to be that the Professor, with the regrettable prejudice that is only too common when non-Catholic scholars approach the consideration of things Catholic, has found his inspiration and sought for evidence to support it mainly in second-hand and untrustworthy sources, and has not taken the trouble to consult or understand the originals. In his Jansenist authorities, he has discovered, of course, what he wanted, and no sense of justice towards a living body of men has interfered to prevent him setting down the calumnious results of his blundering investigations. He has been treated by Father Brodrick with much more consideration than he shows towards those whom he thinks such easy game to attack, but, after this complete exposure of his fundamental misconceptions of the science of casuistry, delivered with a research superior to his own, and with a far truer appreciation of the issue at stake, he will realize, we fancy, what Kingsley felt when his sneering remark produced the "Apologia."

PHILOSOPHICAL.

Readers of THE MONTH have had the various fascicles of the monumental *Handbuch der Philosophie* (R. Oldenburg, Munich) brought to their notice in the order of their publication. The last four fascicles to appear are *Philosophie der Sprache*, by Professor Julius Strenzel, *Ästhetik (Schluss)*, by Professor Alfred Baumler, *Geschichtsphilosophie*, by Professor Erich Rothacker, and *Philosophie der Technik*, by Professor Manfred Schroeter. The whole work will eventually comprise six volumes. Two of these, viz., Vol. I, *Die Grunddisziplinen* and Vol. IV, *Staat und*

Geschichte, are now complete. These two volumes, both of which contain full indices, strengthen the impression of real solid worth which was aroused by the separate parts. The work is massive in its comprehensiveness. No sphere of human thought or activity has been left out of consideration. Though the work is not exclusively Catholic, the list of contributors contains such well-known Catholic names as Father Przywara, S.J., Professor Dempf of Bonn, and Professor Spann of Vienna. This history of human culture presupposes in its readers a certain maturity of thought and is not intended for beginners, nor will all its views be acceptable to Catholics, but it presents a synthesis of philosophical thinking which has no parallel in English.

It is certain that the medieval Scholastics never seriously questioned the existence of the external world. They would have regarded such a doubt as meaningless. In his *Le Thomisme et la Critique de la Connaissance* (Desclee: 10.00 fr.) M. Regis Jolivet presses for the maintenance of this point of view in modern epistemology. In his two complementary studies on the nature of the critical problem and the problem of real doubt, he brings out very clearly what is meant by a theory of knowledge. Such a theory can only deal with the relation of thought to being, and not with the existence of being as such. Realism is so obviously implied by the psychology of knowledge that to question the existence of the objective world is both arbitrary and unphilosophical. In fact, the evidence for an extramental reality is so clear that its denial is simply unthinkable. We do not reflect on thought in order to discover in thought an object which is independent of thought, but in order to find the conditions under which thought can be assimilated to being. In his elaboration of this principle of St. Thomas, M. Jolivet has made a valuable contribution to the science of epistemology.

The latest volume to be published in the *Analecta Gregoriana*, a series of theological and philosophical studies by post-graduate members of the Pontifical Gregorian University, is *The Problem of Error from Plato to Kant* (Pont. Univ. Greg.: 15.00 l.), by Father Leo W. Keeler, S.J. It deals with error, the crux of any theory of knowledge, from the historical point of view. A mere enumeration of the authors, more than twenty in all, whose writings are examined, would give an incomplete idea of the value of this work. What is more important is the conspicuous conscientiousness which is shown in the criticism of texts. No other writer has treated this problem so fully or so successfully. It is a pity that so useful a book should be disfigured by many misprints.

DEVOTIONAL.

Bolted food is not easily digested and not fully nutritious. Both assimilation and nourishment presuppose mastication. Similarly, the rich meanings of our common prayers are apt to remain spiri-

tually useless if we merely recite them, "by heart" indeed, but not heartily or mindfully. Hence, Father Moffatt, following what is known as St. Ignatius's "Second Method of Prayer," shows us in **Taste and See** (Bruce Publishing Co.: 75 c.) how to extract from our ordinary formulas of devotion, by pondering leisurely over their sense, the greatest amount of spiritual sustenance. A very timely and useful book.

The Rev. John Driscoll, S.J., is well known for his love of those Latin hymns which are such a precious heritage of our Catholic past and yet are so much neglected. In **Think Upon the Cross** (B.O. & W.: 1s.) he has translated twelve Latin hymns which are, as he tells us in his Preface, "of a character purely lyrical, unshackled by the conditions imposed upon liturgical compositions . . ." and which make admirable devotional reading for one anxious to meditate with profit on Our Lord's Passion.

The Benedictines of Teignmouth have done English readers a service by making accessible to them the simple and devotional studies by Père Avrillon entitled **Devotions on the Divine Infancy of Jesus Christ** (B.O. & W.: 2s. 6d.). In twelve "meditations" on as many mysteries of the Infant Life of Christ, the author has given us much to dwell upon, and his thoughts are of the greater value being drawn as they are chiefly from the words of Scripture and from the writings of the Early Fathers.

A Notre Dame Sister has arranged some **Thoughts of Blessed Julie Billiart** (B.O. & W.: 2s. 6d. and 4s.) in the now somewhat too popular form of one for every day in the year. They are all of sound and solid piety and will be helpful to many who like to take their spiritual reading in small doses.

LITURGICAL.

A brochure of much importance, though of limited application, originally compiled by the direction of Cardinal Vaughan, when Bishop of Salford, has been re-written and enlarged in a fourth edition, called **Directions for the use of Altar Societies and Architects** (B.O. & W.: 2s. 6d.). It states and illustrates the present liturgical law for the canonical furnishing of Churches and Ceremonies of the Roman Rite, without discussing the wider questions of "the architectural side of church equipment, such as the material and design of altars, nor with its artistic aspect. . ." Nor does it deal with "existing abuses such as the faulty construction and unlovely decoration of many of our present altars, theatrical 'effects' in church lighting and the rest." Yet, while the material of much critical discussion is thus excluded, the booklet contains a great deal which will help towards correct taste in church decoration, and quotes in full the trenchant decrees on that topic of the Cardinal Vicar of Rome which have resulted in a wonderful improvement in Roman church interiors.

HISTORICAL.

The lady whose chequered career has been traced in *The Life and Letters of H.R.H. Charlotte Stuart, Duchess of Albany* (Eyre & Spottiswoode: 16s.), by the well-known antiquarian, Major Francis Skeet, was the great-granddaughter of James II, being the natural daughter of Charles III, and the last of the line of Stuarts. She died at the age of thirty-six, having been recognized as her royal father's heiress only for the last six years of her life. Major Skeet threads his way with considerable skill through the tangled history of the time so far as it concerned the Stuarts, and his fully-documented study will be of immense interest to all—and how many they still are!—who are attached to the Stuart memory and tradition.

Father Humphrey Johnson of the Birmingham Oratory has written a singularly useful pamphlet—*Vatican Diplomacy in the World War* (Blackwell: 1s. 6d. n.)—which enables the reader to trace in detail the consistent labours of the Popes for peace and justice, and how, on the score of religion or nationalism, they were as regularly frustrated. It has been generally realized since that Pope Benedict's "Peace Note" to the Powers in August, 1917, contained the elements of a settlement, which would have consolidated most of the benefits of the War and avoided most of the futility and waste of the Peace. This is a book for Catholic publicists to study and to keep in mind; for false views of the Papal action have been widely prevalent, and are not yet dispersed.

M. Georges Goyau has developed, in a highly-useful volume—*L'Eglise et la Guerre* (Flammarion: 12.00 fr. n.)—the doctrine of the Church on the practice of war, as it grew more explicit through the ages and extended into other denominations, and the history of the various interventions, in the cause of peace, of the Heads of the Catholic Church, the one supra-national organization, which is, therefore, more concerned than any merely national body with the maintenance of international harmony. In the historical retrospect the temporal power of the Papacy, which served at times to complicate the Church's witness against war, is only touched on: that and the whole question of the Crusades, in which is embraced the theory of the "Holy War," waged, first of all, in defence of Christianity in the East, and later extended to all who anywhere threatened the integrity of Christendom, would need fuller treatment than could here be given. But no doubt is left that the Church to-day has consistently and energetically denounced every form of warfare except that waged in self-defence, and has anticipated, in every point, the efforts of the civil Powers to establish international peace.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

It is rather a "mixed grill" that Professor Stockley presents us with in his *Essays in Irish Biography* (Longmans: 6s. n.), his

subjects being Thomas Moore, the poet, Canon Sheehan, the novelist, and Dr. Henebry, the Celtic scholar. After his wont, the biographer introduces a vast amount of interesting, though not always relevant, matter, and his four essays (for Moore is dealt with both as a patriot and as a Catholic) incidentally range over history and literature in a way which exhibits a curiously well-stocked mind. Moore he faithfully depicts as an Irishman who preferred England to his own country, and as a Catholic who, without hesitation, brought up his children as Protestants. Neither Ireland nor the Church has much reason to be proud of him. Canon Sheehan's views are deduced from his books, which were all designed to correct the faults of his fellow-countrymen and inspire them with the highest ideals: his lessons are needed as much to-day as ever. Dr. Henebry was Professor of Irish at Cork, with a short interval at Washington University, and the account of him brings us into the thick of Celtic controversies, and the battle for the teaching of Irish. But the essayist, as we have implied, is universal in his literary tastes, and includes in his biography a defence of English Poetry against the Celtic Professor.

In these days of economic problems and much pre-occupation with the material condition of the working-classes, it is opportune indeed to have one of their number proving to us that there is a life of the soul that can be lived unhampered by sordid surroundings. In **Matt Talbot** (B.O. & W.: 2s. 6d.), Father James Cassidy has given us a series of short studies on the life of this saintly Dublin workman, which can hardly fail to stir many to emulate his wonderful spirit of penance and prayer.

It is to be regretted that the otherwise beautiful life of **Blessed Louise de Marillac**, by Prince Emmanuel de Broglie, translated by Father Joseph Leonard, C.M. (B.O. & W.: 5s.), should not have been at least corrected up to date before publication. The book is entitled "Blessed" Louise although she has lately been canonized, and we are told at the end that the cause of her *Beatification* has been introduced! Moreover, the statistics of the Sisters of Charity which follow might easily have been made more accurate. But apart from these evidences of somewhat hasty work we would recommend this sympathetic and unpretending study of the co-Foundress of the Sisters of Charity. It will be useful to know that since she has been canonized under this name, which was her family name, that of Madame Le Gras, her married name, is less likely to be used; in the past, Lives have been written calling her Le Gras, which name appears too in many lives of St. Vincent de Paul.

SOCIOLOGICAL.

It was a happy thought to bring together in one handy and cheap volume the gist of Cardinal Manning's economic teaching, expressed in lectures, articles and letters during his long and

active life. This has been realized in *The Dignity and Rights of Labour and other Writings on Social Questions* (B.O. & W.: 2s. 6d.), by Cardinal Manning. Their perusal will make evident the Cardinal's right to interpose, as he so often and so fruitfully did, in the disputes between Capital and the working-classes, for they show that he had a grasp of principle and a knowledge of labour-conditions, of which few of his contemporaries could boast. And his views will still be an inspiration to his co-religionists here and in America, since many of the abuses which called for their expression are not yet remedied.

LITERARY.

Amongst the many ways in which the enlightened zeal of to-day is trying to impress upon young and old the unique importance of Holy Mass in the Christian life, we know none better than is embodied in an elaborate Pageant-Drama called *The Sacred Mysteries of the Everlasting Sacrifice* (Herder: 7s. c.), which has been written by the Rev. M. Helfen and is published in the U.S.A. by "The Catholic Dramatic Movement," Milwaukee; not the first, apparently, of other similar religious plays produced from the same source. This particular drama cleverly combines the history of the fall, penitence and redemption of Man with the successive stages of the Holy Sacrifice, the significance of which is gradually explained by "Truth" to "Pilgrim." The idea gives scope for illustrating, by voice and action and pageant, from the Old Testament and the New, the inexhaustible beauty and truth of the Divine Liturgy; it demands a cast of forty-four speaking characters, some of which can be duplicated, and many others to form crowds and choruses. "The Grail" is familiarizing us here with the possibilities of this form of sacred Art: the present example seems well within the scope of their tradition and talents.

Outside the Catholic Church also, the Christian spirit finds expression to-day in a revival of the sacred drama from which, in this country as elsewhere in antiquity, the art of acting took its rise. Poets like Housman have devoted much of their talent to religious plays, and many who are not poets have cast into dramatic form various episodes drawn from the almost inexhaustible field of God's dealings with mankind. Out of multitudes of such productions, Messrs. Methuen have published in one neat volume *Seven Sacred Plays* (price, 7s. 6d., but obtainable separately) mainly connected with the Birth and Death of Our Lord—all arranged for acting with abundant stage directions, and prefaced by an essay, by one who is evidently an expert, on the method of producing sacred dramas. Mgr. Francis Gonne's "In the City of David" is one of the seven, and there is another, "The Passion Play of Alsfeld," translated from the German which, having first seen the light in 1501, i.e., in pre-Lutheran Germany, is no doubt Catholic as well in its *provenance*. But we have noticed

nothing in any of them to which Catholics might object. Sir Francis Younghusband, in a striking Preface, points out that Shakespeare, for all his genius, never penetrated with assurance to the ultimate reality which is the love of God, and so did not, perhaps could not, write a supreme religious play.

Professor A. F. Murison has defied an accepted convention, expressed by M. Arnold and emphasized by Tennyson, in translating the first twelve books of the Iliad into English hexameter verse. *The Iliad of Homer, Book I* (Longmans: 10s. 6d. n.) has all the attraction that careful production can give it: it is a small quarto in format and is finely printed with wide margins. The result is probably a nearer approach to the sense and spirit of the Greek hexameters than other metres convey, but we confess that the massed consonants of the English language are often with difficulty forced into the bondage of the dactyl: as, for instance—"Spake he, and, swinging well backward his long-shafted spear, then he hurled it." However, the translation has the merit of keeping close to the original, and, on the whole, it is certainly more "Homeric" than Pope's version.

One is irresistibly, and, we hope, not irreverently, reminded, while reading Abbot Hunter-Blair's *Little Essays* (B.O. & W.: 3s. 6d.), itself the successor of several other volumes of "Memories and Musings," of Burns's lines, "A chiel's amang them, takin' notes." For the Abbot, looking back upon a crowded life of travel and incident—long may it be preserved!—seems to have noted, whether with pen or memory, every noteworthy experience he has met, and he can, apparently at will, recall them all in their proper setting and contrast the old with the new. These essaylets, which have previously graced *The Catholic Times*, range over both space and time, for the Abbot is at home in all varieties of history, political, social, archæological, religious, as well as in many parts of the old and new worlds. And what he has seen and read he has here conveyed to us in a singularly attractive style, which clothes many real contributions to knowledge.

FICTION.

Of a batch of short stories from "La Bonne Presse," Paris, our reviewer reports: *Le Carrefour de la belle Agnès* (Jean Mauciere): A fascinating romance. *Le Rayon de Soleil* (René Duverne): Quite up to the usual style of this popular author. A very charming study of child life. *La Souveraine* (Guy Wirta): Original and interesting. *Tubalcain* (M. M. d'Armagnac): A powerful and moving study of the Jewish question. *Miette et son Parrain* (René Duverne): This charming study of a child is, however, meant for grown-ups, and they will undoubtedly appreciate it. *Couronnes Voilées* (Guy d'Aveline): A veritable fairy-tale in modern life, where Cinderella finds her Prince Charming, and the worldly little sister is irresistibly drawn to the high ideals of the hero who wins

her heart. **Le Forçat** (Pierre Maurice): The tale of heroic self-sacrifice cannot fail to move, and the author appeals by the simplicity and directness of his presentation of the most staggering facts. **Reine et Suivante** (Paule Gourlez): A stirring tale of the adventures of Marie de Gonzague in Poland, the country of her adoption, into which the romance of one of her ladies is skilfully woven. Children can learn quite a lot of history here, but the jam conceals the powder. **Divorcée** (Pierre Maurice): A very touching story, and one well timed for the present day. Grace conquers in the end, brought back to the Mother by her child.

MISCELLANEOUS.

If the volume called **Cardinal Bourne at Westminster** (B.O. & W.: 5s.) and edited by Mr. R. J. Dingle is intended to commemorate his Eminence's sacerdotal Golden Jubilee which occurs this month, no more appropriate memorial could have been devised, for a bishop is pre-eminently a teacher, and this contains the cream of the illustrious Jubilarian's teaching from the *Cathedra metropolitana* of Westminster. But, apart from its occasion, it is a valuable contribution to the Catholic thought of the day, preserving many striking applications of Christian principles to current problems and interpreting the Church's doctrine in regard to many problems, political, economic and moral. All engaged in Catholic Action along the far-flung modern Front will welcome this collection of clear and weighty utterances on such topics as Christian Education, the relations between Capital and Labour, between Church and State, between Catholicism and the sects, between Catholics and political parties, between the nations and the world, amidst the changed conditions after the War. The public memory is short, and even momentous declarations, such as the Pastoral called "The Nation's Crisis" in 1918, are speedily forgotten. This invaluable compilation revives and emphasizes the force of each isolated pronouncement by setting it in a catena of similar declarations, whilst showing the harmony and consistency of Catholic teaching. The justice of the whole Catholic standpoint on Education has never been more clearly and conclusively put than here; never have the true relations between Capital and Labour and the conditions of industrial settlement been better expressed than in a message to a Trade Journal just after the War, whilst the unsound claims of the Established Church to Catholic Continuity have never been more thoroughly exploded than in his Eminence's several pronouncements on the subject. For our lasting benefit, then, the exposition of Catholic teaching on vital points of faith and morality that for over thirty years has issued from Westminster, is brought together in this volume, with just enough commentary to provide chronological setting, and it should be warmly welcomed by all engaged in defending or spreading the Faith.

Messrs. Sheed & Ward are so rightly sure of the excellence of their products that they do not hesitate to present the public with a **Second Anthology** (price 5s.), containing substantial selections from some sixty of their recent publications, arranged to form "readings" in Criticism, Theology, History, Sociology, Controversy, and so on; convinced, as they are, that these tit-bits, whilst fully enjoyable in themselves, will yet engender a desire for the more copious feast from which they are selected. It is difficult to put the book down, so varied and attractive are its contents, and so happily typical of that large choice of sound reading which is the fortunate lot of the modern Catholic.

Captain C. E. Constable, the compiler of **The Pilgrim's Guide to Catholic London** (B.O. & W.: 1s. 6d.), necessarily restricts his attention to the churches and shrines of the metropolis, including a number of those which are now in Protestant hands, but which have historical interest. He has managed to include a great amount of interesting information concerning the past and the present, although in the attempt to be brief, he is sometimes obscure. Nor is his terminology always correct, as when he says (p. 45), "They [the Jesuits] run a large establishment for Novitiates at Manresa, Roehampton." A full list of all London churches, with means of access to them, is given, and of those which are staffed by different European nationalities.

After the pilgrimages of the Holy Year, many of the faithful must be acquainted first-hand with the appearance of the various categories of the Holy Father's "army." As a sovereign ruler he must have one: as Vicar of the Prince of Peace, he uses it solely for maintaining the tranquillity of order. But all the Catholic world will be interested in the history and development of that picturesque band: hence **The Papal Forces** (B.O. & W.: 2s.), an admirably illustrated account by Captain F. R. Mellor, should be welcomed both by pilgrims to Rome, actual and prospective, and by all those to whom a visit to the Vatican is but an impracticable dream.

The recent Jubilee celebrations at the London Oratory have brought the work of the brave men who sponsored the original foundation before the public eye. In **The Story of the London Oratory Church** (Washbourne & Bogan: 1s.), Mr. H. M. Gillett has given us not merely the story of the Oratory as we know it to-day, but of its early beginnings in King William Street, Strand, where the first London Foundation was made in 1849. This account is preceded by a summary of the early history of the Oratorian Congregation, and a careful Index completes a very comprehensive shilling's worth.

Priests and sacristans will welcome the sixth edition of Father Bernard Page's **Practical Guide for Servers at Low Mass and Benediction** (B.O. & W.: 1s.) which has been thoroughly revised

by its author, a Jesuit with many years' experience of altar boys and their needs. A judicious use of a bold type-face for the actual responses makes this an admirable booklet for use on the altar, as well as a mine of information for those just beginning to learn their duties as altar-servers.

"The Story of the Origin and Development of International Eucharistic Congresses together with an account of the Dublin Congress of 1932, and Historical Examples of Ireland's undying devotion to the Blessed Eucharist" is the accurately descriptive sub-title of Father Jerome O'Callaghan's booklet **The Eucharistic Triumph** (Sands: 6d.). The "historical examples" are of especial interest to lovers of Ireland, for they include an account of the finding of the Ardagh Chalice, and the even more romantic story of Father Michael Meehan and the "Ark" in which he travelled the length and breadth of his vast parish in County Clare. Well printed and illustrated, it is an excellent sixpennyworth.

Father Lane's "Handbook for Pilgrims," **This Way to Lourdes** (B.O. & W.: 1s. 6d.), should find a ready sale among those Englishmen and women who have become pilgrimage-minded as a result of the Holy Year. Of the many Lourdes handbooks under which the reviewer's table (not to mention himself) has groaned, this is one of the very best. Comprehensive and practical, its 124 pages cannot fail to fire many with a desire to visit this miraculous shrine, while past pilgrims will find delight in going over the well-loved ground here so vividly described. Seven illustrations and an exceptionally devotional frontispiece portrait of Saint Bernadette, enhance the value of the book.

MUSICAL.

Sir Richard Terry has included in **Two Hundred Folk Carols** (B.O. & W.: 18s.) the results of many years of expert work. The collection is the largest and most representative of its kind that has so far appeared. He has drawn upon many sources for his material: English, French, Besançon, Bernaise, Burgundian, Provençal, Basque, Dutch, Flemish, Italian, German, Alsatian, Polish, European Medieval and English Medieval carols. The result is a veritable storehouse of song, some old favourites, others less familiar, the majority unknown. The research work involved in an undertaking of this magnitude is very great. Sir Richard has performed his task with his usual skill. The harmonies which he provides for the varied types of melodies are always interesting, not over-elaborate and productive of the right atmosphere, be it modal, national or religious. The translations from the original language are of a very high literary merit, having been entrusted, for the most part, to Father John O'Connor, Father Ronald Knox, Canon John Gray and Mrs. K. W. Simpson. We thus have perfect orthodoxy combined with good literary form. There has been

none of that tinkering with the originals with which we are only too familiar in non-Catholic translations. The price, 18s. for the entire work, may seem heavy; but each section of the carols may be obtained separately for prices varying from 1s. to 3s. 6d.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

The C.T.S. have issued two more twopenny pamphlets in their invaluable *Studies in Comparative Religion* series: **The Church in the Christian Roman Empire**, by Rev. Philip Hughes, carries on the study of the Early Church from 427 to 692, and **The Eastern Churches**, by Donald Attwater, deals with the "four unrelated divisions" of the "Eastern Church," namely, the *Nestorians*, the *Monophysites*, the *Orthodox* and the *Uniates*. **The Secret of the Belfry**, by E. Bancroft-Hughes, is a pretty story of the time of Elizabeth.

The Catholic Mind, April 22nd, reprints an excellent lecture, *Biology versus Sterilization*, from the *Linacre Quarterly* (N.Y.), delivered by Dr. Alexander Fraser, A.B., M.D., to the Federated Catholic Physicians' Guild; and another from our own pages *Whither Science?*, by H. V. Gill, S.J.

Miss Ada F. Clarke has compiled a dainty little volume of devotion called **A Newman Prayer Book** (B.O. & W.: 1s. 6d.; 2s. 6d.) for the most part composed of extracts from the great Cardinal's "Meditations and Devotions," and containing sound doctrine as well as aspiration, in the choicest of English.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

ALEXANDER OUSELEY, LTD., London.
Father Arnold Janssen. By F. M. Lynk, S.V.D. With frontispiece portrait. Pp. 239. Price, 3s. 6d.

BARRELL, LTD., Portsmouth.
The Old Bird Series. Nos. 1 to 8. Pp. 20. Price, 6d. each. *A Syllabus of Religious Instruction for Council Schools*. Pp. 88. Price, 1s. 9d.

BRAUCHESNE, Paris.
Saint Jean Chrysostome. By Louis Meyer. Pp. xxxviii, 389. Price, 32.00 fr.

BLOUD ET GAY, Paris.
Initiation à la critique textuelle Neotestamentaire. By Léon Vaganay. Pp. 200. Price, 12.00 fr.

BRUCE PUBLISHING Co., Milwaukee.
Boscobel and Other Rimes. By James J. Daly, S.J. Pp. 86. Price, \$1.50.

BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, LTD., London.

Thoughts of Blessed Julie Billiart. Pp. 145. Price, 2s. 6d. and 4s. *The Life of Cardinal Vaughan*. By J. G. Snead-Cox. Abridged Edition. Pp. 373. Price, 5s. *Our Blessed Lady*. Pp. xv, 260. Price, 6s. *Devotions on the Divine Infancy of Jesus Christ*. By Père Avrillon. Pp. xviii, 110. Price, 2s. 6d. *Saint Benedict*. By the Right Rev. Dom F. Cabrol, O.S.B. Pp. xi, 155. Price, 5s. *The Life of the Soul in the Liturgy*. From the French of R. P. Antoine de

- Sternt, O.F.M. By H. J. Courtney. Pp. 238. Price, 6s. *Judaism, Christianity and Germany.* By H.E. Cardinal Faulhaber. Translated by Rev. George D. Smith, D.D. Pp. ix, 116. Price, 2s. 6d. *Matt Talbot.* By Rev. James Cassidy, B.A. Pp. ix, 69. Price, 2s. 6d. *Oberammergau, Its History and Passion Play.* By E. H. C. Corathiel. Illustrated. Pp. ix, 138. Price, 3s. 6d. *Lectures on the Blessed Eucharist.* By H.E. Cardinal Wiseman. With an Introduction and Additional Notes by the Rev. J. M. T. Barton, D.D. Pp. xvi, 328. Price, 5s. *The Spiritual Direction of Blessed Claude de la Colombière.* Translated and arranged by Mother M. Philip. Pp. xiii, 151. Price, 3s. 6d. *St. John Bosco's Early Apostolate.* Translated from the Work of G. Bonetti, S.C. Pp. xv, 512. Price, 7s. 6d. *Morality extracted from the Confessions of St. Augustine.* By Père N. Grou. Introduction by Dom Roger Hudleston, O.S.B. Pp. xxiv, 326. Price, 10s. 6d. *Think Upon the Cross.* Translated from the Latin Medieval Poets. By J. Driscoll, S.J. Pp. 47. Price, 1s. *A Practical Guide for Servers at Low Mass and Benediction.* By B. Page, S.J. Pp. 54. Price, 1s. *Butler's "Lives."* Vol. IX. September. Edited by H. Thurston, S.J., and D. Attwater. Pp. xii, 394. Price, 7s. 6d. *The Bible for Every Day.* Selected by Archbishop Goodier. Pp. xxiv, 286. Price, 5s. *Don Bosco.* By Johannes Jørgensen. Pp. xvi, 272. Price, 5s. *Five-Minute Sermons.* From the *Universe.* Pp. vi, 170. Price, 3s. 6d.
- CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, London.
The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus. Translated with Introduction and Notes by Burton Scott Easton. Pp. 116. Price, 7s. 6d.
- EDITORIALE "ILLUMINARE," Vitoria.
España en Indias. By Constantino Bayle, S.J. Pp. 448.
- HERDER, Freiburg and London.
Elementa Philosophiæ Scholasticæ. Edited by Dr. Seb. Reinstadler. Two volumes. Pp. xlviii, 1,102. Price, 7-75 rm.
- LETHIELLEUX, Paris.
Jésus—Lumière et Amour. By Abbé Nazaire Favre. Pp. 308. Price, 15.00 fr. *Heureux Age.* By Myriam de G. Pp. 144. *Annuaire Général du Clergé, etc.* Pp. 1,500. Price, 90.00 fr.
- LONGMANS, London.
Prison Letters of Countess Marievitz. Pp. xviii, 316. Price, 6s. n.
- METHUEN & CO., LTD., London.
Hitler's First Year. By H. Fowys Greenwood. Pp. v, 58. Price, 1s. *Christianity and Conduct.* Pp. v, 55. Price, 1s. *Religion and the Sciences of Life.* By William McDougal. Pp. xiii, 253. Price, 8s. 6d.
- OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, London.
The Economic Morals of the Jesuits. An Answer to Dr. H. M. Robertson. By J. Brodrick, S.J. Pp. 160. Price, 5s.
- PONT. INST. ORIENT. STUD., Rome.
Bulletin D'Archéologie Chrétienne. IV. Pp. 96.
- RICH & COWAN, LTD., London.
This Progress. The Tragedy of Evolution. By Bernard Accworth. With frontispiece. Pp. xi, 334.
- ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE, Toronto.
On Being and Essence. Translated from the *De Ente et Essentia* of St. Thomas Aquinas. By Clare C. Riedl, M.A. Pp. 66.
- SHEED & WARD, London.
The History of the Church. Book I. By Philip Hughes. Pp. x, 395. Price, 10s. 6d.
- TÊQUI, Paris.
Victor Hugo "Apologiste." By Chanoine E. Duplessy. Pp. viii, 160. Price, 5.00 fr. *Monseigneur Laveille. 1856—1928.* By E. Laveille, S.J. Pp. 218. Price, 10.00 fr.
- THE AMERICA PRESS, New York.
The Catholic Mind. 1934. No. 8.
- THE CATH. ASSOC. FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE, Washington.
Manchuria. By E. M. Lynskey, Ph.D., and Asia Committee. Pp. 70. Price, 10 cents.
- VAUGHAN SCHOOL, Kensington.
Honour. A Talk to Boys. By John G. Vance, M.A. Pp. 19. Price, 6d.
- VRIN, Paris.
Précis D'Histoire Monastique. By Montalembert. Pp. xxxii, 344. Price, 20.00 fr.
- WASHBOURNE & BOGAN, LTD., London.
The Story of the London Oratory Church. By H. M. Gillett. Pp. 64. Price, 1s. *Guttergrin the Gargoyle.* By Cecilia Oldmeadow. Pp. vi, 112. Price, 5s. *The Royal Way.* By Fr. Oswald Bennett, C.P. Pp. 140. Price, 3s. 6d.

s
y
e
k

i.
i.
r,
3.

n
i.

ly
e,

ry
4.
le.
2.
r.
ce,